THE MEMORIAL LIBRARY
Southwestern College

QUARTERLY JOURNAL of SPEECH

Speech Association of America

APRIL · 1959
Volume XLV · Number 2

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

1915 — 1959

Published by
THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Editor
Donald C. Bryant
11-A Schaeffer Hall
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Editor-Elect
Richard Murphy
University of Illinois

Associate Editors

Carroll C. Arnold	BRITISH PUBLIC ADDRESS	Cornell University
Wallace A. Bacon	INTERPRETATION	Northwestern University
Earnest S. Brandenburg	ADULT EDUCATION	Washington University
Robert D. Clark	HOMILETICS AND PREACHING	University of Oregon
Carl A. Dallinger	COMMUNICATION SKILLS	State University of Iowa
Douglas Ehninger	PUBLIC SPEAKING AND FORENSICS	University of Florida
Leland M. Griffin	AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS	Northwestern University
Robert G. Gunderson	NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW	Indiana University
Warren Guthrie	TV AND RADIO	Western Reserve University
Marie K. Hochmuth	RHETORIC AND CRITICISM	University of Illinois
John V. Irwin	SPEECH AND HEARING	University of Wisconsin
Magdalene Kramer	TEACHING OF SPEECH	Teachers College, Columbia University
Richard Murphy	SHOP TALK	University of Illinois
David Potter	BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL SPEAKING	Michigan State University
Claude L. Shaver	DRAMA AND THEATRE	Louisiana State University
G. K. Thomas	PHONETICS	University of Florida
William E. Utterback	DISCUSSION	Ohio State University

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH is published in the months of February, April, October, and December. Contributions prepared in accordance with THE MLA STYLE SHEET may be sent to the Editor or to the appropriate Associate Editor. Subscriptions and requests for advertising rates should be addressed to Owen Peterson, Executive Secretary, Speech Association of America, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge 3, Louisiana.

Entered as second-class matter at the postoffice at Columbia, Missouri, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Regular subscription price $5.50 per year. Special subscriptions for undergraduate students $3.50 per year. Single copy of current issue $1.50. A comprehensive Index of the issues of the year is found in each December JOURNAL. The contents are also indexed in the EDUCATIONAL INDEX. For volumes prior to 1929 consult the READERS GUIDE TO PERIODICAL LITERATURE. For complete, analytical coverage through 1954, see INDEX TO THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, VOLUMES I-XL, 1915-1954, compiled by Giles W. Gray (1956). Volumes I-III were published under the title THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PUBLIC SPEAKING; Volumes IV-XIII, THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION.

Copyright 1959 by the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOL. XLV · APRIL 1959 · NO. 2

Educational Television: A Faculty Point of View	*William P. Fidler*	121
Open Heart Surgery on Television: A Case Study	*John P. Highlander*	128
A Synthesis of Experimental Research in Stage Fright	*Theodore Clevenger, Jr.*	134
The Rhetoric of Political Protest	*Harry P. Kerr*	146
A Philosophy for Rhetoric From Bertrand Russell	*Donald L. Torrence*	153
Benito Mussolini, Crowd Psychologist	*Frank Iezzi*	166
John Morley's Speechmaking (The British Orators, VII)	*Hermann G. Stelzner*	171
Alla Nazimova and the Advent of the New Acting in America	*Clifford Ashby*	182
Bloomfield's "Non-Syllabic" Clusters	*David B. Strother*	189
Rhetorical Genres in Davenant's *First Day's Entertainment at Rutland House*	*Jackson I. Cope*	191
Seventeen Who Made History—The Founders of the Association	*Andrew Thomas Weaver*	195
The Forum		200
Excerpts from the Minutes of the Administrative Council		200
Business Meetings		202
Budgets Submitted and Approved		202

Excerpts from the Minutes of the Meetings of the Legislative Assembly 203
Proposed Amendments to the Constitution 205
Committees for 1959 207
Election of the 1959 Nominating Committee 208
Grey Flannel Mouth Once More *Harold P. Zelko* 208
Zeta Phi Eta Award
Children's Theatre Conference *Mrs. Harold R. Dinges* 209

New Books in Review *Robert G. Gunderson* 210
Tension and Tragedy *Hubert C. Heffner* 210
The Abbey Theatre *Edwin Burr Pettet* 212
A Primer for Playgoers *Gordon E. Beck* 213
The Magic-Maker: E. E. Cummings *Don Geiger* 213
T. S. Eliot: A Symposium for His Seventieth Birthday *Irving Deer* 214
The Modern Researcher *J. Jeffery Auer* 215
The Americans: The Colonial Experience *George V. Bohman* 215
Heritage from Hamilton *and* The Mind of Alexander Hamilton *Bower Aly* 216
The Jacksonian Persuasion: Politics and Belief *and* Andrew Jackson and North Carolina Politics *R. G. G.* 216
Created Equal? The Complete Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858 *Forest Whan* 217
The Coming of the New Deal *Austin J. Freeley* 217
The Articulates *Orville Hitchcock* 218
Speech is of Time *A. L. McLeod* 219
Television and Radio Writing *and* Television Writing and Selling *Edward Stasheff* 219
College Teaching by Television *Samuel L. Becker* 220
Television and Radio Announcing *Jerome Landfield* 221
A Compendium of Research and Theory on Stuttering *Harold L. Luper* 221
The World's Great Speeches *John F. Wilson* 222
A Picture History of the British Theatre *Eugene K. Bristow* 222
Communication Skills—The Basic Course *David C. Ralph* 222
Teaching the Mother Tongue in Secondary Schools *Clara K. Mawhinney* 223
American Education. The Thirty-Second Discussion and Debate Manual, 1958-59 *Everett Hunt* 223

Shop Talk *Richard Murphy* 224

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLV APRIL 1959 NUMBER 2

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION: A FACULTY POINT OF VIEW

William P. Fidler

EDUCATIONAL television for college teaching, though still in an experimental stage, has acquired zealous advocates and considerable financial support. The new medium of communication has appealed particularly to college and university administrators, wealthy foundations, and some segments of the commercial television industry. If ETV has sound potentialities for effective teaching and learning in higher education, its values are being given ample opportunity to emerge.

Among the college professors, who will supply most of the "talent" for ETV courses and programs, there are supporters and skeptics, but the majority are non-committal, preferring to await the profession's evaluation of ETV on the merits of performance and student progress. In experiments of this kind, the academic community normally suspends judgment until the facts are available for analysis, but in this instance a special kind of caution is apparent. The professors are in a position to know, more intimately than any other group, the nature of the risks involved and the complexity of the problems posed by institutional promotion of telecourses.

Will ETV advance or retard educational standards? Are all academic subjects suitable for television instruction? Can the image of a good teacher perform more or less effectively than the teacher himself? What happens to academic freedom when provocative instruction reaches beyond the limits of a small group that is accustomed to the give-and-take of traditional college teaching methods? If higher learning is dependent upon pursuing truth with fearless dedication to principle and fact, can truth be sought with the same independence and selfless devotion through a mechanical device which the general public has come to accept as an enjoyable bonus to commercial advertising?

These are questions to which answers are not readily available, and for which time and thoughtful appraisal are needed. But they do suggest that enthusiastic supporters of ETV would be

Mr. Fidler (Ph.D., Chicago, 1947) is General Secretary of the American Association of University Professors. Before joining the staff in the Washington office, he had been Professor of English at the University of Alabama. The present article, which he prepared for QJS *at the request of the editor, presents some timely ideas and materials which he had discussed at the meeting of the ETV Station Managers at Madison, Wisconsin, last August.*

well advised, during the pioneering stage of its development in higher education, to heed the doubts of their cautious colleagues.

There are other problems, immediate and practical, to be solved at all institutions which have inaugurated ETV instruction or plan to do so. The rights and concern of all groups—students, faculty members, administrative officers, and the general public—are inherent in these problems and must be considered. For the purposes of this discussion, the concern of faculty members in ETV will be examined in the light of reports which have reached the author from many campuses—reports by supporters as well as skeptics.

2.

Faculty resistance in some quarters has discouraged ETV planners and prompted them to ask: Will faculty members cooperate sufficiently to give television a chance to prove itself? The academic profession will continue to be interested in all mechanical devices and new media of communication as these developments give promise of contributing to the effectiveness of teaching or to the attraction of programs of general cultural enrichment. Faculty opposition to ETV which is not grounded upon facts and reasoned conclusions, but rather upon vested interests or irrational prejudices, will wither away if ETV can demonstrate clearly that the new medium, at its best, is no less effective and often more effective than good conventional classroom instruction.

Faculty members' acceptance of and participation in telecourses and other programs of cultural content will relate primarily to maintaining and improving teaching and learning standards. However, if evaluation of television instruction is to be secondary, in the promotion of ETV, to its utility in reaching a greater number of students per instructor, the teaching faculties will undoubtedly resist the expansion of television in higher education. It may be premature to suggest such a possibility, at this pioneer stage, but many thoughtful faculty members are worried about the possibility of lowered standards in telecourses. In particular, they are dubious of the emphasis currently being placed on the capacity of ETV to reach a greater number of students, and if this emphasis is set forth as the major gain of ETV over conventional classroom teaching, the ETV planners will have difficulty in convincing professors that television is a more effective device than loud-speakers in an auditorium.

Early in the present century, another experiment in the extension of college instruction to great numbers of students was broadly established: the program of correspondence study courses for college credit. A half century later, professors and administrators are still seeking means of maintaining standards as uniformly in home-study courses as in campus courses; many scholars are convinced that the two methods of instruction cannot be equated successfully, in relation to standards or to college credit. It is true that thousands of persons can complete correspondence courses at home, and that these courses undoubtedly have special merits of their own, but the advantages are *different* from those which are associated with on-campus courses.

Planners of ETV courses who are thinking primarily of reaching thousands of students would do well to examine the record of the earlier experiment. They should probe into the following conclusion of an experienced professor: correspondence work is so easily administered and "taught," so lucrative for the grader and the insti-

tution, and meets the special needs of grade-school teachers so readily (in supplying "credit" necessary for renewal or up-grading of teaching certificates), that the experiment became a fixture, in spite of a general belief in the academic community that most home-study courses do not meet the standards of traditional campus courses in the same subjects.

A report has reached the author from another skeptical professor, having three years of experience in ETV and twenty-eight years in conventional teaching, that ETV planners are making a grave mistake in concentrating upon telecourses for college credit. He admits that telecourses in certain subjects have advantages and special attractions of their own, but he argues, as did the teacher cited above, that they are *different* courses from those taught in the same subjects by conventional means. He might have added that no testing methods yet devised can fully evaluate some of the losses sustained or certain gains accomplished by adoption of the new medium. Thus, a dramatic example of automation in higher education is being given its chance, even though skeptics understand the difficulty of demonstrating what is lost or gained in the process. The lack of objective proof, however, is not likely to silence the skeptics.

A very interesting prophecy has reached the author's desk: ETV planners will eventually discover a richer mine of service through programs devoted to general cultural enrichment than is now available through widespread use of television in courses for college credit. This academic prophet cites the important contributions of the lyceum concept to American cultural history as an example of the kind of goal which ETV planners should keep in mind. In view of the publicity recently given to budgetary savings made possible by telecourses, the prophecy's fulfillment may be late in arriving upon the academic scene.

All viewers of ETV, including the skeptics mentioned above, will undoubtedly admit that general cultural enrichment, through programs not a part of college courses, has been offered from time to time by the ETV stations. However, a broad goal of cultural enrichment is not the primary purpose of many specialized college courses which are receiving the major attention of ETV producers at the present time. One reason for the concentration upon telecourses for college credit, particularly at institutions which are not adjacent to large metropolitan populations, is that ETV needs the kind of financial base which is supplied by fees paid for telecourses that have the same status as conventional campus courses. There are other and certainly more professional reasons for offering telecourses for credit, but the budgetary factor needs careful examination if the academic community is to maintain perspective in considering the aims and purposes of ETV. In the halls of ivy, as elsewhere, the awkward posture of the money giant often appears where one would rather not meet him.

Fortunately, there appears to be no lack of frankness and aggressiveness in meeting criticism of ETV and the problems which plague it at this pioneer stage, if the published studies in the field are representative of the attitudes of ETV planners. For instance, thorough evaluation of telecourses is being urged as essential to the future academic health of ETV; in fact, the zeal with which this idea is being advanced is partially responsible for the insistence that telecourses should be equated exactly with their counterparts in the regular academic program. It is to be hoped, however, that ETV evaluators will not place complete reliance upon objective tests,

efficient as they may be in certain areas of testing. There are certain factors in the educative process which are difficult or impossible to reduce to the simplicities of objective testing: namely, improved ability to reason in a given subject, precision and grace of expression in handling advanced problems in a field of knowledge, initiative in supplementing the textbook, and perhaps that most civilized of all educational experiences, the wisdom to recognize the things one does not know and the grace to admit one's ignorance modestly. Testing procedures for these and similar factors in educational growth depend largely upon subjective evaluations, but anyone who wishes to determine what college instruction, through ETV or other means, has done to student minds must deal with them. Much is yet to be learned about testing, and possibly the ETV promoters and teachers can bring fresh approaches to this ancient problem.

3.

Wherever ETV is in use or under consideration, much thought is being given to the rights of the "talent" which plays the major role in the productions. From the point of view of the teacher and the producer, the amount of "released time" for the instructor is crucial, since preparations for effective television instruction are exacting, particularly during the first three or four presentations of a telecourse. While experience is being gained at the present experimental stage, most faculty members appear willing to enter into temporary arrangements, frequently at the sacrifice of other academic interests. Administrators must begin to condition their budgetary thinking toward the liberal side, if they want to give ETV a reasonable chance of success, without permitting it to interfere with other professional concerns of the institution.

The faculty at one large university accepted the following arrangement for "released time" during each semester of the academic year 1958-1959: the television teacher's full teaching load to be one telecourse, having three thirty-minute broadcasts per week for sixteen weeks, the course giving three semester hours of credit; while offering the telecourse, the teacher is to have no other teaching assignment, but he will be available at scheduled times for telephone consultation and for office conferences with his television students; also, he is to prepare the examinations and supervise the grading of them. The teacher is expected to devote many hours to preparations, rehearsals, and consultation with technicians as the telecourse proceeds. For the semester's teaching program devoted exclusively to ETV, the teacher receives his regular instructional salary, plus $500 additional pay in consideration of the unusual amount of time and effort necessary *before* the telecourse begins. Such an arrangement has the virtue of treating instruction by ETV, even at this pioneer stage, as a professional undertaking. The ETV teaching staff and the administration at this institution will reconsider the agreement periodically, in the light of accumulated experience.

At the opposite pole is the following agreement on "released time," which leaves much to be desired: an instructor who normally has a classroom teaching load of twelve clock hours, is to offer a telecourse similar to the one mentioned above, and in addition he is to have a campus teaching load of six hours per week (two courses); he is expected to devote the same amount of time and effort to non-broadcasting chores as we described above; he receives his regular salary, with no honorarium for necessary work before the

telecourse begins. This arrangement concedes only one point: that a telecourse requires about twice as much of the teacher's time and effort as a conventional classroom course. It is doubtful that the ETV job can be done professionally, from a technical as well as an academic point of view, with so little "released time" of the instructor.

Budgetary problems necessarily enter into the picture, and the teacher and college administrator must decide whether the sacrifice is to be the teacher's or the budget's. In recent years, grants from foundations have been available to subsidize reasonable arrangements for "released time," but thought must now be given to institutional financing of ETV. Administrators and teaching faculties would be well advised to plan modest ETV programs which are adequately supported by modest budgets. It would be unfortunate if only the well endowed institutions played important roles in the development of ETV; on the other hand, ETV might suffer to a greater extent, in the long run, if numerous institutions attempt to promote instruction through this medium with inadequate financing. Certainly, the college professors of this land are presently making enough economic and personal sacrifices without saddling them with additional ones.

The residual rights of a faculty member in kinescopic reproductions pose questions seldom encountered before in contractual relations between a faculty member and his institution. It is not possible under present Federal laws to copyright kinescopes. By analogy with printed materials, one would suppose that the "artist" chiefly responsible for a filmed teaching performance should have some kind of legal protection similar to copyright. Several experienced ETV teachers have expressed the view that a written contract with one's institution is a satisfactory method of protecting the rights of faculty talent.

One administrator recently informed the author that a teacher has no right to royalty claims incident to the making and use of kinescopes. He argued that an institution contracts for the teacher's time on the basis of a yearly salary, and for this reason the institution should own all rights in kinescopic reproductions, just as it has title to all of the books in the college library. The administrator was reminded that teachers have traditionally written books and retained the royalties from them, and that the academic profession has assumed that this kind of creative activity is a part of a college teacher's obligation to the advancement of knowledge in his field. The administrator insisted that the analogy is imperfect, since the teaching done before the television camera is a part of the professor's teaching load, whereas books are written in spare hours. Besides, the administrator argued, television production is so costly that the institution should be the sole beneficiary of all revenues. A rebuttal was pressed mildly, which mentioned the professor's use of library books, equally expensive in the aggregate, as he creates books which are owned by himself and his publisher, pointing out that in the case of ETV kinescopes the institution's role is almost identical with that of a publisher.

The different points of view in the argument just cited go deeper than the views expressed on this occasion. If college teachers are truly members of a learned profession, they are not hired hands whose time is bought and whose creations should be vested in the corporation. Institutions of higher education may be incorporated for legal

reasons, but they are different in fundamental ways from commercial corporations, and their faculties go about their professional obligations quite differently from persons employed by industry and commerce. College professors who are treated as salaried employees will tend to become "company men," with disastrous results to the free pursuit of truth which is the lifeblood of American colleges and universities. The issue of residual rights in kinescopes and similar considerations are relatively minor problems in higher education, but the philosophy used in settling these problems is fundamental to the health of the academic profession.

The following general principles to protect the rights of faculty talent whose broadcasts are recorded on film or tape for future use over TV or radio have been suggested to the author by professors with experience in ETV. (a) Any repetition of a program should be approved in advance by the talent which created it. This is particularly important in subject matter which changes or develops continuously, and the scholar must be given the right of passing judgment on the accuracy and completeness of the recordings, since his reputation and that of his institution are at stake. (b) Remuneration for the various types and extents of repetition should be comparable to that for published books. If kinescopes or tapes are retained for future institutional use, for rental to other colleges or to commercial enterprises, or for outright sale of copies, the talent should receive a percentage of the profit. This principle should apply to repetitions of the broadcasts within the institution which originated them if the audience is composed of tuition-paying or fees-paying students. Repetitions which produce no profit whatever should be by arrangement with all interested parties, as is currently the case with permissions to reprint non-profit publications.

Experience in reaching specific agreements on residual rights is limited, but three reports have reached the author. At one institution where kinescopes and tapes are to be rented or sold, the faculty talent will receive 50% of the net receipts, "net" being defined as total receipts less direct costs to the institution in the making, selling, or renting of the copies, but not including general overhead. The faculty and administration may have a problem in agreeing upon what is and is not "general overhead," but since all agreements of this nature should be considered as exploratory and temporary, professional people should eventually arrive at satisfactory arrangements.

At another institution a faculty committee, representing talent which will produce a series during the academic year 1959-1960, is considering the proposal that the talent receive a flat and single fee of $5,000 for the right to rent or sell the recorded series to other institutions. Some book publishers enter into similar arrangements with authors.

At a third institution the following proposal, relating to the original ETV production and to residual rights in kinescopes and tapes made at the time, is under consideration: the talent will receive a flat fee for the series or course of study, the sum to be calculated in reference to hours devoted to the project, with due consideration for the "released time," if any. The informant suggests that the first arrangement will be sheer conjecture, and that future agreements will be made in terms of experience. As royalties for repetitions, a percentage of the original flat payment will be agreed upon, perhaps 40% for use by TV, and 30% for use by radio.

4.

Reports from campuses indicate that problems may arise concerning the choice of individuals who will do the television teaching. Journalistic criticism of ETV instruction mentions the "stars" who are performing in a truly dramatic manner, and references are made to the "master teachers" whose special endowments, we are told, should be more widely used. The assumption seems to be that these "superior" teachers will stimulate greater student interest and motivation—a gain with which no one could quarrel, if ETV can bring about this result. Before accepting the assumption as a fact, the planners of ETV should think about the nature of student learning on the college level, and the contribution which the teacher makes to student progress. It is doubtful that "inspiration" or entertaining performances by the teacher contribute as much to student accomplishment as hard work by the student himself, and there are various ways of encouraging the student to work at peak capacity. No brief is offered for the dull teacher, but many a serious graduate of our colleges has paid warm tribute to prosaic and non-dramatic teachers who still managed to guide their students toward a thorough grounding in the graces of living and thinking, and in certain problems related to earning a living. There may be "master teachers" on our campuses who can make fruitful uses of ETV, but we should take a hard look at what we are trying to do in ETV before we settle upon talent which is primarily clever, charming, or entertaining.

It has been suggested that problems may arise with respect to professors who are urged by the administration to offer telecourses but are reluctant to do so. It may be necessary, under certain conditions, for faculties to take collective action to protect themselves against pressures to make television appearances when individual teachers indicate a reluctance to use ETV facilities. Clear evidence of reprisals against these teachers—in the form of non-renewal of term appointments, losses of promotions, or failure to receive salary increases—for their refusal to appear on television should be examined by appropriate committees of the faculty and administration in the light of principles generally accepted by the academic profession.

Problems may develop at the opposite extreme, in reference to the teacher whose eagerness to appear on television will prompt him to sacrifice the normal interests which are traditionally associated with the academic profession: reading and research in his special field, preparation of works for publication, activity on campus committees, attendance at scholarly meetings, and similar obligations to his discipline and institution. There is the related problem concerning teachers whose talents—in music, art, and public speaking in particular—make them especially desirable for television programs.

5.

If it should appear that principles and philosophical observations have dominated this discussion, to the exclusion of many practical matters, the author is frankly not apologetic. In these hurried times, we are often prone to place efficiency and dispatch above deliberation in many of our transactions. Since higher education is devoted to services which are related to pursuit of truth, we are well advised to be patient with the individual or organization which seeks to plot its course by principles.

OPEN HEART SURGERY ON TELEVISION: A CASE STUDY

John P. Highlander

ON the evening of June 23, 1958, an eight year old youngster literally had his heart opened to a public of over 1,200,000 television viewers in the San Francisco Bay Area. With cameras mounted in the operating amphitheatre at Stanford University Hospital, a San Francisco television station, KPIX, telecast, for the first time in American television, the actual proceedings in "Open Heart Surgery."

For almost two hours the skilled hands of the surgeons moved with delicate precision and the close-up lenses of the TV cameras gave the viewers a vantage point equal to that of the chief surgeon. The congenital hole between the upper chambers of the heart of young patient "Tommy" was repaired while a heart-lung by-pass machine did the work of the human heart and lungs.

During the first three days following surgery a battery of specially installed telephones at the TV studio recorded over 98,000 calls from viewers inquiring about the patient. The reports were good; the operation was successful. Today Tommy can join his playmates with physical equality.

This program made history in San Francisco television if not in the entire television industry. The program, which was commercially sponsored, produced the highest audience rating ever shown for a locally produced Bay Area television effort. An ARB of 38.6[1] gave the program top position in the June ratings. Even the most popular network-produced entertainment shows took a second place.

More than three months after the telecast the San Francisco press was still giving coverage to "TV-Tommy." In publicity and promotion, local, regional, and national press gave the program activity over 70,000 column-inches of coverage. Television stations in various parts of the country requested films of the program for local scheduling.

This program marked a unique advance in local program development. It was thought daring by some. A few observers credited the success to "fool luck." Yet it was undeniable that from every point of measurement, "Open Heart Surgery" was judged a tremendous program success.

This report is an analysis of the entire program activity, designed to contribute helpful information on two important questions of television programming and production: 1) Does television have the right to enter an operating room where human life may hang in the balance and televise the proceedings for public consumption? How can the matter of good taste and ethics be determined? 2) What program and pro-

Mr. Highlander (Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1953) is Visiting Lecturer in Speech at the University of Michigan. He was formerly Assistant Program Manager at KPIX Television, San Francisco. He has also served as Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Wisconsin.

[1] An American Research Bureau rating of 38.6 indicates the percentage of the television homes in the area tuned to the particular program. The figure does not represent the percentage of the sets-in-use at any particular time. For the program in question the ARB of 38.6 represented well over 60 per cent of the available audience at that time.

duction procedures were responsible for the success of this program?

It is clear that the concept of "right" involved here is one of propriety and cannot be determined by set formula. The attitude of the television station on this point was summarized when a producing executive remarked, "The right of television can only be evaluated when we examine the reasons behind the presentation of such a program."

Although the program was commercially sponsored, the immediate commercial motive was not of primary importance to the television station. As a matter of fact, in order to clear time for the program it was necessary to preempt commercial programming which would have produced much higher revenue. What then were the reasons which prompted the television station to produce this program?

Each broadcasting station reflects for its audience a corporate image or character. Such an image, if it reflects broadcasting leadership and an attitude of community service and responsibility, can be one of the broadcaster's greatest assets. "Open Heart Surgery" provided KPIX with an opportunity to promote its corporate image through what was felt to be a significant program contribution.

The San Francisco Medical Society worked closely with the television station in the development of the program. Indeed, it was a Medical Society inquiry which prompted the idea for the program, and the eventual telecast was under the society's auspices.

The association between the Medical Society and KPIX had extended over a period of two years. During that time the two organizations had cooperated in the presentation of a weekly series of medical programs, "House Call." As a result of this program association the Medical Society thoroughly appreciated television's capacity to reach effectively a large public and to present a considerable body of medical information interestingly and inoffensively.

The cooperative experience permitted the television station to discover in the Medical Society a sympathetic attitude toward program experimentation on medical subjects of general public value. In addition the station discovered some very effective on-camera talent among the men of medicine who had appeared on the program series.

Quite probably the motives which finally prompted the Medical Society to suggest the heart surgery program were born in the two years of successful telecasting of "House Call." When the press asked the Medical Society to define the purposes of the "Open Heart" program, this was the reply:

> This will help to present a realistic and accurate picture of medicine. The program is to inform without being sensational, to emphasize the advances in this particular field of surgery and to show the necessity for well-trained teams in performing this and certain other highly specialized surgical and medical procedures. This latter may be a relatively new concept for some of the viewing public, but it is one of which we feel the public should be aware.

The surgeons who performed the delicate operation were members of the faculty of the College of Medicine of Stanford University. In cooperation with these surgeons and officials of the Medical College, the objectives of the program were clearly defined and the method of treatment in production was agreed upon. The surgeons regarded the program proposal as a worth-while effort in public information, and the cooperation extended by Stanford University was enthusiastic and complete. The University of California College of Medicine at Berkeley also agreed on the public information value of the project, and

the college cooperated by sending several members of the faculty to appear on an opening part of the program.

Young "TV-Tommy" was the older of two boys in his family. His parents had known for several years that surgery would be required to correct his heart defect. When the surgeons informed them that the proper time for the operation had arrived, Tommy's father, a Navy man, was given emergency leave and flew from his Pacific duty station to be on hand.

The Stanford University surgeons and Medical Society officials discussed with the family the possibility of televising an open heart operation. The attitude of the parents was one of sympathetic understanding of the intended values of such a telecast, and they gave their consent to televise Tommy's operation. On the eve of the surgery Tommy's mother told reporters, "We want to share this critical moment with others in the hope that other people with similar problems may be given courage."

"Open Heart Surgery" was commercially sponsored by a national pharmaceutical house. The commercial motive was institutional identification rather than direct product advertising. The attitude of the advertiser toward this program is in part reflected by the fact that he used only three brief institutional mentions during the entire program of almost two hours. The total commercial time was less than one minute.

Such were the participants in the intimate human drama which was played before the television cameras. The motives represented ranged from the commercial interests of the sponsor to the educational intentions of the medical faculty members concerned. In the preparation and production of this program, these several different individual motives did not appear to clash, but rather to complement one another. As a result, there developed a working atmosphere in which all participants felt they were engaged in a program activity of genuine public value.

Although the transmitting station bears the ultimate responsibility for all its programming, it is often not the station's opinion alone which can determine a moral or ethical "right" to broadcast a particular program. From the conception of this program it was clear that a right to broadcast depended upon the acceptance and support of several organizations and institutions and upon the consent of the patient's parents. Each organization—the colleges of medicine at Stanford University and the University of California, the San Francisco Medical Society, and KPIX—considered the idea. A "right" was suggested when these organizations agreed that the concept was worth while and pledged their support. The "right" was substantiated when the parents agreed that the operation should be televised. The "right" was confirmed by the overwhelming public acceptance.

In addition to the instances of public acceptance noted above, several hundred unsolicited letters were received after the telecast. Only one letter questioned the right to televise the operation, and the writer of that letter confessed that she had not seen the program but just thought the idea was in "bad taste." On the other hand, over 60 per cent of the letters contained specific comments suggesting the informational value of the program.

From the moment the program idea was approved and cleared for telecasting, the matter of its programming and production became paramount. The project was immediately given active backing and support by top management.

The effect of this type of support was to key the entire staff to the importance and significance placed on the project.

A top-rated local entertainment program was pre-empted, and "Open Heart Surgery" was scheduled in a 10 P.M. time period. This scheduling represented the best adult viewing-period available to this network-affiliated station. Because network programs were scheduled until 10 P.M., a major part of the viewing audience was delivered to the special program.

All production planning was audience-centered. This fundamental, often overlooked in the maze of production procedures, was of absolute importance because of the delicate nature of the subject matter. The audience was regarded as an active participant in the production development.

It was decided that the production approach should be direct and should be guided by complete honesty in the treatment of the subject. The scripted opening to the program illustrates this directness and honesty of treatment. The opening shots were of the surgery team preparing to make the opening incision into the patient's chest. An off camera voice read the following lines in a calm, direct, and conversational manner:

This operation is taking place now, as you see it. We are in the surgery amphitheatre in Stanford University Hospital in San Francisco. An 8-year-old boy is on the operating table. His name is Tommy. He was born with a defective heart. Without surgery Tommy's chances of living to maturity are very slim. With surgery his hope for life improves tremendously. Because Tommy has so little to lose and so much to gain, his parents and his doctors have decided on this operation. It is only fair that you know—as they do—that there is a risk. Operating within the human heart is complicated, difficult, and dangerous. Until very recently it was thought to be impossible. The San Francisco Medical Society and KPIX have arranged for this first telecast of open heart surgery with the heart-lung machine so that you may better understand how modern medicine and surgery are practiced.

Detailed and intense production planning could not alter the fact that the events of the actual operation could not be fully anticipated or controlled. Trouble or even death was statistically possible either during the operation or soon after. Mention of this risk was neither avoided nor minimized.

All members of the production crew were thoroughly drilled in the details of an emergency plan. At each of the several control points, a medical doctor, monitoring the picture, stood by to notify the director in the event trouble developed. At the first sign of trouble, the microphone above the operating table was to be cut, and the picture was to switch from a close-up of the operation to the balcony of the amphitheatre and to the surgeon who was serving as commentator. The commentator was to tell the audience as much as seemed appropriate about the difficulty. If additional time was needed to cope with the emergency, the panel of doctors stood ready at the studio to comment on the problem as they saw it.

In the event of death while the program was on the air, the control point would immediately switch to the studio. There the dean of one of the Bay-Area medical colleges was prepared to read a brief statement which would reiterate the conditions which led to the decision to operate. It would conclude with the surgeon's philosophy of life and death as he views it in his professional work.

The total arrangement for the coverage of the operation was guided by the principle that the cameras and production were present as observers and not as participants. The television cameras were reporters in the operating room. No "dramatic" shots of equip-

ment were used to heighten effect, no attempt was made to introduce artificial elements. Instead, equipment shots were used only to show the equipment performing its assigned function and only after the audience was aware of what the machine was and what part it played in the operation.

The direct and honest treatment of the subject required full frankness. The subject of the program was the repair of a fault in the human heart. Therefore, it was necessary for the audience to be able to see that repair clearly and at close-up range. Indeed, it was felt that during the televising of the surgery, extreme close-ups of the heart, which would isolate it from the chest opening and from the total picture of the patient, would tend to reduce the uneasy feeling some viewers might experience. In practice, this theory was borne out.

To provide the proper angle for close-ups it was necessary to mount a camera overhead in order to have an unobstructed view. The mounting site was a platform on the balcony of the amphitheatre directly over the operating table. This camera was equipped with a 16-inch lens.

The producer once again carefully considered possible viewer reaction. The pictures from the overhead angle would seem so close that some viewers might question how it was possible to get such pictures without interfering with the operation. This reaction might well have produced a negative response to the whole program idea and so defeat the purpose. To answer this and similar questions, an exact model of the operating room was exhibited in the opening portion of the program showing the operating table and basic equipment as well as the placement of all television equipment.

The program was structured in three units. The first unit, which took approximately 30 minutes, was produced in the television studios. It was felt that the viewer must have certain basic information about the heart and its function in order to profit from the program. Further, it was felt that the viewer should understand something about the surgical procedures and equipment to be seen.

A group of selected specialists used models, pictures, hand props, and specially shot motion pictures to provide the background information. Other specialists described the heart defect and discussed the symptoms which led to the diagnosis. Lastly, the technique of suturing the walls of the heart was demonstrated using needle and thread and a piece of cloth. All material was carefully reduced to lay terms.

During the first unit of the program at the studio, the surgeons had made the initial opening into the chest cavity. When they had completed this step the studio was notified and the program switched to the remote location in the operating amphitheatre. There, for almost 80 minutes the actual heart repair took place. Viewers shared these dramatic moments through the close-up camera overhead and a floor camera which pictured the working heart-lung machine.

During surgery, an off camera narrator described what was taking place. The narrator was a surgeon and a frequent member of this operating team. The narration was calm and authoritative and was used only to explain or comment when there was obvious need. A considerable portion of the program was without comment.

The final program unit began after the suturing of the heart opening. At that time the chief surgeon completed

his work and left his position. He moved to a microphone away from the operating table and reported briefly on what he had found and how the operation had progressed. The program then switched back to the studios for a short recapitulation and the showing of motion pictures of children at play who had previously undergone this operation.

All of the crew members and the station announcers had been thoroughly familiarized with the surgical procedures and the operating room atmosphere many days prior to the program. Some crew members had seen several heart operations before the telecast date. The announcers and key members of the production crew had met young Tommy and his parents. As a result of this meeting the production crew was interested in something more than a technically perfect job.

The interest of the press was aroused through the same directness of approach used in planning the production. Science editors and news reporters, as well as radio-television writers, were invited to the hospital a week before the operation. There they met and talked with the doctors who would perform the surgery. They were invited to see the operating room, and a few actually saw a similar heart operation.

Tommy's family name had been withheld from the press in order to protect the family privacy. However, a few days before the operation the family invited the press for an interview. There they answered questions about their feeling toward the operation and its being televised. They also gave permission to use Tommy's last name. By that time, however, it was not important, for young Tommy had already been taken into the heart of the public. There is no question but that the success of the program, measured by size of audience, can be traced in large part to tremendous press.

The success of this local television milestone was not achieved by chance but rather by conscientious and imaginative application of production basics which should apply to all programming:

1. "Open Heart Surgery" was an intimate human drama with great natural appeal. It is axiomatic that the more closely one can play to universal likes, attitudes, wants, and needs, the more surely may one count on audience interest and concern.
2. The entire activity was handled with completeness of attention to detail and concern for proper audience reaction. Through every stage of planning, writing, designing, and production preparation, the audience was recognized as an active partner. The program was effectively organized for the audience.
3. The entire treatment of the program effort was handled with directness, honesty, and a mature sense of good taste. There was nothing artificial about the program. There was no effort at forced dramatics.
4. The executive producer used the advice and counsel of many people during the preparation of the program. However, his was the final responsibility for the activity. He was given authority equal to the responsibility. No creative activity can successfully evolve from a committee. Neither can a producer hope for success unless he is given the authority to carry out his plan.

No one of the reasons for success noted above could have been sufficient. Television is a cooperative and integrated association of many parts. It is when all of the parts are working in harmony toward a worth-while goal that television programs are significant.

A SYNTHESIS OF EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH IN STAGE FRIGHT

Theodore Clevenger, Jr.

EXPERIMENTAL research into rhetoric and public address is growing rapidly in scope and volume, and a few areas of study have been so extensively exploited by experimental and quasi-experimental methods that the time has arrived for synthesis of the findings.[1]

Nowhere are experimental findings readier for synthesis than in stage fright. Many investigators, following independent lines of research, have accumulated an impressive backlog of findings. Viewed as a whole, this body of research first appears contradictory and confusing, but a thorough-going analysis of it reveals a remarkable consistency. Analysis also suggests hypotheses which emerge only when experiments are compared.

The key to fruitful comparison of experiments lies in an understanding of the problems of definition and measurement as they apply to research in stage fright, where these two problems become inextricably intertwined.

A typical approach to the problem of definition for experimental purposes was that of Floyd I. Greenleaf, who defined "social speech fright" as: ". . . an evaluative disability, occurring in social speech situations, and characterized by anticipatory negative reactions of fear, avoidance, and various internal and overt manifestations of tension and behavioral maladjustment."[2] Validation of this definition proceeded as follows.

Students in a basic speech course rated themselves on a four-point self-rating scale of social speech fright. Those who placed themselves in the "severe" category were interviewed, and on the basis of these interviews and some external materials, a "Situational Speech Inventory" was prepared and administered, along with the original four-point self-rating scale of social speech fright, to 786 public speaking students. The inventory consisted largely of a list of symptoms. Those symptoms which distinguished well between persons indicating much and persons indicating little stage fright on the scale were said to be typical of stage fright.

It is important to note that the method of determining who had and who had not stage fright had nothing to do with the verbal definition offered. In the Greenleaf study, the subjects chosen for analysis were persons who rated themselves high on a self-rating scale of social speech fright. Presumably, if these persons had responded in the interviews in a way that was incompatible with the verbal definition, then the definition would have been discarded. The real definition, then, was not the verbalization, but the scale used to detect the presence of stage fright.

In a similar case, Chenoweth was con-

Mr. Clevenger is Instructor in Speech at the University of Illinois. *Portions of this article first appeared in the author's doctoral dissertation, "An Analysis of Variance of the Relationship of Experienced Stage Fright to Selected Psychometric Inventories," submitted at The Florida State University in 1958, under the direction of Dr. Clarence W. Edney.*

[1] The writer and a colleague plan syntheses of other experimental areas in addition to that offered here.

[2] Floyd I. Greenleaf, "An Experimental Study of Social Speech Fright," Unpublished M.A. thesis, State University of Iowa, 1947.

cerned with "adjustment to the speaking situation," which he defined as follows: "The Process of Adjustment to the Speaking Situation . . . is the process by which the speaker, in executing the speech act, adjusts, organizes and controls the functioning of his bodily mechanism in accordance with, and in spite of, conditions within the immediate speaking situation."[3] This definition, however, did not play a crucial role in the experiment, since the criterion of speech adjustment was a seven-point judges' rating scale.

Gordon Low defined stage fright as: ". . . the emotional disturbance of the physical and mental behavior of the public speaker as it is manifest by the observable characteristics: poor eye-contact, nervous hand movements, restless shifting of feet, awkward posture, body quiver, timid voice, embarrassment and other physical and vocal cues empathically perceived."[4] In the experiment, however, Low designated as possessing high degrees of stage fright only those persons who received high self-ratings on a scale similar to those of Chenoweth and Greenleaf.

The joint study performed by Gibson and Prall ostensibly makes no effort to define stage fright, but says nevertheless: "It has been assumed that the term stage fright may be used conventionally to indicate the complex, and usually unpleasant, emotional states which frequently accompany the experience of public performers."[5] But in the experiment, the measure of stage fright was a five-point judges' rating scale. It had nothing to do with the definition.

No case may be found in which a categorical verbal definition played a controlling role in a stage fright experiment, though there are few experiments which do not offer one. In each case, the ultimate definition of stage fright—and the only one which makes sense experimentally—is the operational definition which describes the instrument used to measure it. In other words, the measuring instrument in a stage fright experiment is not only the measurement of stage fright, it is the definition as well.

Stage fright measures fall into three rough categories: observer rating scales, introspective measures, and devices for measuring physiological changes during speaking. Under appropriate conditions, any of the three may be highly reliable, but reliabilities of various rating scales for observers have received the most intensive study.

Dickens, Gibson, and Prall report a study of the reliability of a five-point rating scale of stage fright. When sixty-one speech teachers and graduate students rated forty student speakers, the split-half reliability of the scale was .98. When groups of five were correlated against the whole judging group, the coefficients ran between .92 and .98. Since the correlation of a sub-group with a larger group including it will usually produce spuriously high coefficients, we may assume that the true reliability of groups of five judges who are college speech teachers and graduate students in speech falls somewhat below this figure—say, between .85 and .95. Since differences between individual judges' ratings were pronounced, the true reliability of individual judges' ratings on a five-point scale of degree of stage fright is probably quite low. These findings,

[3] Eugene Chenoweth, "The Adjustment of College Freshmen to the Speaking Situation," *QJS*, XXVI (1940), 585.

[4] Gordon Low, "The Relation of Psychometric Factors to Stage Fright," Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Utah, 1950.

[5] Milton Dickens, Francis Gibson, and Caleb Prall, "An Experimental Study of the Overt Manifestations of Stage Fright," *SM*, XVII (1950), 37.

taken with Eckert and Keys' finding that groups of three and four judges produced correlation coefficients of .68 on a similar scale,[6] suggest the hypothesis that *groups of judges are able to make judgments of stage fright of an order of reliability varying as a negatively-accelerated monotonic growth function of the number of judges.*[7]

In addition to number of judges, the reliability of rating scales of this type seems to be affected by characteristics of the speakers and the judges. Dickens, Gibson, and Prall report that sex, experience, and area of interest did not affect reliabilities of the rating scales used in their experiments. However, they were working with a rather select group of speech instructors and graduate students. Parker found reliabilities on the identical scale, when used by groups of sixteen and more undergraduate students, to be substantially below the reliabilities found in the Gibson and Prall experiments.[8] This suggests that *either age or training in speech or experience in speaking or some combination of these bears some relation to reliability of judgments of stage fright, but that reliability is not a linear function of these factors.*

The data of the Gibson and Prall experiments suggest that judges are less reliable in judging fearful speakers than in judging confident ones. *Teachers of speech are evidently in stronger agreement concerning what constitutes the absence of stage fright than what constitutes its presence.*

Reliabilities of introspective measuring devices have rarely been established. In the case of introspective rating scales, like that used in the Hendrickson study,[9] it is impossible to establish reliability, because the two usual methods for testing it cannot be employed. Since the scales are one-item scores, it is impossible to perform a split-half correlation, and since the precise speech experience is unrepeatable, it is not fruitful to perform a test-retest correlation.

In addition to rating scales, introspective measures of stage fright include subjective reports, like the Lomas questionnaire,[10] and inventory tests. Extensive reliability study of quantified subjective reports is not available at the time of this writing. On the other hand, the reliability of one inventory test is well established. An extensive study of the reliability of the "Personal Report of Confidence as a Speaker" (PRCS), involving over 400 students, produced a split-half reliability coefficient of .93. As a measure of reaction to a specific speaking experience, split-half and odd-even coefficients are the best means of establishing reliability. The test-retest correlation of .60 reported by Gilkinson is of little value in assessing the reliability of the instrument, since a speech experience cannot be repeated.[11]

Obviously, the reliability of instruments for measuring physiological reactions to the speech situation is the most highly reliable of the three classes of stage fright measures. Though test-retest and split-half coefficients cannot

[6] Ralph G. Eckert and Noel Keys, "Public Speaking as a Cue to Personality Adjustment," *Jour. of Applied Psych.*, XXIV (1940) 153.

[7] The same is true of other psychological phenomena. See J. P. Guilford, *Psychometric Methods* (New York, 1936), Chapter 14.

[8] Milton Dickens and William R. Parker, "An Experimental Study of Certain Physiological, Introspective and Rating Scale Techniques for the Measurement of Stage Fright," *SM*, XVIII (1951), 251-259.

[9] Ernest Hendrickson, "A Study of Stage Fright and the Judgment of Speaking Time," *Jour. of Applied Psych.*, XXXII (1948), 521-535.

[10] Charles W. Lomas, "A Study of Stage Fright as Measured by Student Reactions to the Speech Situation," Unpublished M.A. thesis, Northwestern University, 1934.

[11] Howard Gilkinson, "Social Fears as Reported by Students in College Speech Classes," *SM*, IX (1942), 141-160.

be performed on pulse-rate, psychogalvanometer, and sphygmomanometer readings, one may assume high reliabilities for such measurements.

To summarize the results of research into the reliabilities of various measures of stage fright: Under proper conditions a measurement of very high reliability can be made using either observer ratings, subjective responses, or measures of physiological change, although the reliability of observer ratings is apparently influenced by the number, age, and experience of the raters, and by the specific range of stage fright represented by the subjects of the experiment.

Surprisingly, instruments which are so reliable display comparatively poor intercorrelations. Results of comparisons of various indices of stage fright suggest that the emotional disturbance which is recorded on physiological measuring devices is different from both the emotional disturbance which the speaker reports having experienced, and the emotional disturbance which a group of judges report having observed, and that the latter are different from each other.

Dickens reported that for his group of forty male speakers, selected to form a normal distribution of stage fright, averaged judges' ratings of a group of college speech instructors produced a correlation coefficient of .59 with the PRCS. The reliabilities of both instruments used in this study were above .90.

Using identical measurements, but a less sophisticated group of judges, Parker found that for 100 students similar to those in the prior study, the correlation between PRCS and averaged ratings was a mere .20.

Williams, using similar but not identical instruments, found that observer judgments ran below subjective reports in the majority of the cases.[12] Gibson and Prall obtained the same result.

These findings suggest two hypotheses. First, considering the high reliability of the instruments and low correlations between them in separate experiments involving different subjects and judges, the Dickens-Gibson-Prall experiments and the Parker experiment taken together suggest that *introspective measures of stage fright measure a variable that is somehow different from that which is measured by averaged judges' ratings.* Second, the consistency with which judges' ratings ran below introspective accounts of stage fright suggests that *a group of observers tends to notice less disruption in the speaker than the speaker reports having experienced.* In connection with the second hypothesis, it is interesting to note that Wrenchley's group of prominent speakers defined stage fright largely in cognitive terms. The kinds of experience which they reported suggested that they viewed stage fright as a largely covert experience with only occasional overt concomitant behavior.[13]

Measures of various physiological changes during speaking coincided no better with either introspective or judges' ratings than did these with each other. When Redding compared introspective accounts with measures of galvanic skin response he found no consistent relation.[14] Comparing circulatory fluctuations with both judges' ratings

[12] Norma G. Williams, "An Investigation of Maladjustment to a Speaking Situation Shown by Seventh, Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Grade Students in a Secondary School," Unpublished M.A. thesis, State University of Iowa, 1950.

[13] Elma Dean Orr Wrenchley, "A Study of Stage Fright Attacks in a Selected Group of Speakers," Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Denver, 1948.

[14] Charles W. Redding, "The Psychogalvanometer as a Laboratory Instrument in the Basic Course in Speech," Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Denver, 1936.

and the PRCS scores. Parker found that the amount of circulatory disruption correlated rather poorly with the other variables.

These findings concerning the intercorrelations of various measures of stage fright suggest strongly that they are not measures of the same variable. Although they may be associated with each other in some way, the hypothesis is advanced that *audience-perceived stage fright, cognitively-experienced stage fright, and physiological disruption are three variables which operate with only moderate interdependence during the course of a public speech.*

It therefore seems that referring to a measure of any one of these as a measure of stage fright is not justified, since any one measurement will not bear a direct relation to any categorical verbal definition of stage fright nor will it be likely to correlate well with any other dimension of measurement. Instruments like the Lomas questionnaire and the PRCS are devices for measuring *cognitively-experienced stage fright;* instruments like the judges' rating scale are devices for measuring *audience-perceived stage fright;* and instruments like the sphygmomanometer and the psychogalvanometer are devices for measuring *physiological reactions to speaking.* These may be thought of as the amount of fright a speaker says he has, the amount his audience says he has, and the amount a meter says he has. At least for the present, it appears wise to think of these as three separate variables.

All studies reported to date have made the implicit assumption that one or another of these instruments was a more or less valid and reliable "measure of stage fright." This has led to apparently conflicting findings. If one adopts the position that these are three different variables, and maintains the distinctions among them, conflicts between studies disappear and the entire body of research assumes an orderly structure.

Studies of stage fright symptoms have been complicated by failure to grasp the essential differences between introspective, physiological, and observational variables at work in the speech situation. This may account for the apparent conflict between Henning's findings and those of Gilkinson. Henning correlated quantified Lomas questionnaire scores with judges' observations of specific speech behavioral patterns, and found no regular "symptoms of stage fright."[15] On the other hand, Gilkinson compared similar observations with PRCS scores, and found significantly more listlessness, lack of eye contact, lack of projection, and lack of expression in badly frightened students than in those displaying virtually no stage fright.

Despite an apparent conflict, these studies complement rather than contradict one another. It must first be noted that both Henning and Gilkinson were comparing measurements in the cognitive dimension with measurements in the observational dimension. King's independent evidence leads us to expect that any such relationship will be relatively weak.[16] Furthermore, each was comparing partial measures of audience-observed stage fright with an over-all measure of experienced stage fright. Thus, the relationship between experi-

[15] James H. Henning, "A Study of Stage Fright Through the Comparison of Student Reactions and Instructor Observations During the Speech Situation," Unpublished M.A. thesis, Northwestern University, 1935.

[16] Thomas R. King, "An Experiment to Determine the Relationship Between Individual Visible Manifestations of Stage Fright and the Degree of Stage Fright Reported by the Individual," Unpublished M.A. thesis, The Florida State University, 1958.

enced stage fright and specific observable behaviors should be, on the average, quite weak indeed. Gilkinson's method involved comparing mean scores on the behavioral measures between the top fifty and the low fifty PRCS scores selected from a group of some 400 students—a procedure which has no predictive value with respect to persons between these extremes but is certain to reveal as significant virtually any trace relationship. On the other hand, Henning's test of significance for the correlation coefficient used the whole range of confidence rather than the extremes, a procedure which will yield significance only if there is a strong linear relationship between the variables. Both studies, then, produced results which are reasonable in view of the hypothesis that experienced stage fright and observed stage fright operate with only moderate interdependence in the speaking situation. Both studies suggest that *between over-all measures of experienced stage fright and observational indices of specific speech behaviors, a positive but weak relationship prevails.*

Because of the failure to distinguish sharply enough among types of measurement, studies like those of Jones and Lerea, if taken as analyses of stage fright symptoms, are subject to serious limitations. Jones found that fifty students who were rated high in stage fright by two instructors in speech reported that they experienced significantly more forgetting, confusion, weakness, pounding of the heart, fear of audience disapproval, fear of failure, and insecurity about their speech materials than did a group of fifty students rated low in stage fright by the instructors.[17] It is interesting to note that the Jones study is a precise mirror image of the Gilkinson study. Where the Gilkinson experiment compared over-all measures of experienced stage fright with partial measures of observed stage fright, the Jones study compares over-all measures of observed stage fright with partial measures of experienced stage fright. Both studies contrasted groups drawn from the extremes of fear and confidence. However, on the basis of neither study can we draw firm conclusions concerning symptoms of stage fright. To claim that Gilkinson showed that listlessness, lack of eye contact, and other behaviors are symptoms of stage fright, is to claim that specific overt behaviors are symptoms of cognitive states. In the Jones study, to say that fear of failure, confusion, and the other states are symptoms of stage fright, is to claim that cognitive states are symptoms of overt behavior classes. Both positions are of doubtful defensibility.

Likewise misleading are Lerea's conclusions, if interpreted to mean that low verbal output, low vocabulary, stammering, and errors are symptoms of stage fright. The most one can say from this study is that students who rate themselves high in stage fright at the beginning and low in stage fright at the end of a course in speech tend to display lower output, smaller vocabulary, and more stammering and errors at the beginning than at the end of the course. We would expect this kind of improvement in a first course in speech whether students improved in confidence or not; hence the findings here are by no means clear concerning the experimental variable. Even if they were, it would be difficult on this basis to assert that the verbal behaviors are symptoms of stage fright, since the "symptoms" were meas-

[17] Marnetta M. Jones, "The Relationships of Certain Personality Traits to Stage Fright," Unpublished M.A. thesis, Stanford University, 1947.

ured in one dimension, while the "stage fright" was measured in another.[18]

Without suggesting in any way that experimentation into the relationships among experienced stage fright, observed stage fright, and physiological change is worthless, the above studies do imply a principle which might guide research into stage fright symptoms in the immediate future: those experiments may be expected to produce the most fruitful results which measure both stage fright and its symptoms in the same measurement dimension. That is, if stage fright is measured by an instrument such as the PRCS, then those symptoms should be measured which are cognitive in nature. If stage fright is measured by an observer rating scale, then the appropriate symptoms are classes of behavior.

Such studies have not been altogether neglected. For example, Hendrickson found that students who report having experienced severe stage fright are able to make much better judgments of elapsed speaking time than are other students.[19] Greenleaf reported that students indicating high experienced stage fright reported having experienced inability to finish speaking, weakness of voice, inability to look at the audience, tremors of bodily extremities, feelings of audience disapproval, and stammering. Both of these studies help to define symptoms of one dimension of stage fright, the cognitive experience.

Studies of the relation of stage fright to other factors also fall into a more coherent pattern when the distinction between types of measures is preserved. Gilkinson reported that college women experienced more fear as indicated by PRCS scores than did college men, and Williams found that girls in the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth grades reported more fear and less confidence than did boys on a "Student Reaction Sheet."[20] At the same time, Gilkinson and Knower reported that college men displayed more random behavior and fidgetiness according to judges' observations than did women, and Williams found that boys scored lower in confidence on an "Observer Check Sheet." Parker reported that men made more confident scores on the PRCS than did women, while classmates tended to rate women higher in confidence on a rating scale. Clevenger found a consistently higher mean PRCS score for women than for men, in groups matched for other variables.[21] Ainsworth and King found no significant difference in degree of stage fright between groups of college men and women.[22]

Clearly, most studies show a sex difference for degree of stage fright. In every case where a significant difference was observed, men indicated less experienced stage fright while women were judged to display less stage fright by audience observers. These studies suggest that *judges observe stage fright more in men than in women, while women experience more stage fright than men, but the differences in both cases are small.*

Observed stage fright clearly bears some relation to judgments of speaking ability. Gilkinson and Knower reported that poor speakers are more often rated

[18] Louis Lerea, "A Preliminary Study of the Verbal Behavior of Speech Fright," *SM*, XXIII (1956), 229-233.

[19] Ernest Hendrickson, "A Study of Stage Fright and the Judgment of Speaking Time."

[20] Howard Gilkinson and Franklin Knower, "Individual Differences Among Students of Speech as Revealed by Psychological Tests," *QJS*, XXVI (1940), 243-255.

[21] Theodore Clevenger, Jr., "An Analysis of Variance of the Relationship of Experienced Stage Fright to Selected Psychometric Inventories," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Florida State University, 1958.

[22] Stanley H. Ainsworth, "A Study of Fear, Nervousness, and Anxiety in the Public Speaking Situation," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1949. Also King.

by judges as fidgety and nervous than are good speakers. Eckert and Keys reported that the correlation of "poise" and ratings of general speaking effectiveness was .77, higher than that for any of the other factors of speaking.

On the other hand, experienced stage fright may not bear a close relation to judgments of speaking ability. Gilkinson found that the PRCS for 420 college students correlated only .39 with judges' ratings of speech skill. This raises the hypothesis that *observed stage fright bears a strong negative relationship to judgments of speaking ability, while experienced stage fright bears a weak negative relationship to judgments of speaking ability.*

Apparently conflicting studies concerning the relation of experienced stage fright to speech experience may be reconciled if a careful distinction is preserved between experimental samples. Kinsley interviewed sixty prominent speakers, quantified the results, and found no correlation between amount of stage fright regularly experienced by these speakers and either extent of speech training or amount of speech experience.[23] On the other hand, Chenoweth interviewed fifty speakers who obtained high confidence ratings on the Barnes Scale and fifty who had obtained low ratings, and found that the more confident speakers had undergone more training and experience in speech.[24] Low, using a similar technique, found that students with high stage fright tended to have little speech experience.[25]

Of course, it is possible to explain these differences in terms of computational procedure. Quartile and octile comparisons in general yield significance more often than tests of significance for the correlation coefficient. However, it is not necessary to resort to a comparison of statistical methods in this case, since the differences between the samples suggest a more fundamental explanation. It may be noted that Kinsley's group of prominent speakers represented a rather narrow range of variation in both speech experience and degree of stage fright—all displayed very high experience and very low stage fright. On the other hand, Chenoweth and Low drew samples from beginning speech classes, doubtless representing a very wide range of variation in both variables, though unquestionably well below Kinsley's sample in speech experience. It is a fact that a correlation coefficient performed upon data from a narrow range of variation in both the x and the y variables, will generally run much lower than a coefficient performed upon a sample including a wide range of those variables. Thus, for experienced speakers, where virtually all of the sample had low stage fright and high experience, the correlation would run low; but in a basic speech class, where wide ranges of both prevail, a higher coefficient would be expected. It is also fact that the bottom end of a negatively-accelerated monotonic growth function conforms more nearly to the assumption of rectilinearity implicit in the Pearson r than does the top end of the same function. Violation of this assumption will generally produce a spuriously low coefficient. The hypothesis is suggested that *speaker confidence is a negatively-accelerated monotonic growth function of experience in speaking.* This conjecture draws some support from Kinsley's report that all of the speakers he interviewed reported great reductions in stage

[23] Wade Allen Kinsley, "An Investigation of the Phenomenon of Stage Fright in Certain Prominent Speakers," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1950.

[24] Chenoweth, "The Adjustment of College Freshmen to the Speaking Situation."

[25] Gordon Low, "The Relation of Psychometric Factors to Stage Fright."

fright since their early speaking careers, and that their stage fright diminished most within the first year of speaking.

Emery found that eleventh grade students received generally higher confidence scores on the PRCS than did eighth grade students.[26] Williams found that, for both observed stage fright and experienced stage fright, tenth grade students received higher confidence scores than did students in the lower grades. Ainsworth found that age was not significantly related to introspective or observational measures of stage fright for a large sample of college students. These findings are not in conflict if we hypothesize a relationship between stage fright and age that is other than a simple rectilinear one. Taken together, these studies suggest that *experienced stage fright is a curvilinear decay function of age, the asymptote of the function being approached before age twenty.*

The relation of stage fright to intelligence has received collateral attention in several studies. Gilkinson found correlations of PRCS and ACE-T scores of .05 for men and .12 for women. Eckert and Keys found a correlation of .34 for a mixed group of men and women between ACE scores and ratings of poise. Low found significantly lower ACE-L scores for a group of students with both high experienced stage fright and high observed stage fright, than for a group of students with low experienced and observed stage fright; but he found that Q and T scores were not significantly different for the groups. Clevenger discovered no significant difference in mean PRCS scores for high, median, and low scoring groups on the ACE-T score. These combined findings suggest that observed stage fright may correlate better with intelligence test scores than does experienced stage fright, and that linguistic aptitude may correlate more strongly with certain measures of stage fright than does over-all intelligence.

Certainly, the Low study hints at some relationship between stage fright and verbal skill. Although Ainsworth found that students with high experienced and observed stage fright did not differ significantly in reading ability from students with low experienced and observed stage fright, he found that the confident students read more. Low found differences between similar groups in vocabulary, reading ability, reading speed, and English achievement. He found that students in the high stage fright categories disliked English Composition more than any other course. Since there is no clearly-defined single variable running through all of these findings, their meaning must remain a question for the moment. Further, because of the method of selection of groups in these two studies, it is not clear whether the relation, if one exists, is with experienced stage fright, observed stage fright, both of these, or some complex function of them.

More often than any other variable, personality has been studied in its relation to stage fright. The personality factor expected to correlate best with stage fright is social adjustment. Gilkinson found that for a large group of college students, Social Adjustment scores on the Minnesota Personality Test correlated .46 with PRCS scores. However, Eckert and Keys found practically no correlation between judges' ratings of poise during speaking and either unsociability or social adjustment as measured by the Bernreuter and the Bell respectively.

Preserving a distinction between meas-

[26] Richard M. Emery, "An Evaluation of Attitudes of Fear and Confidence in Speaking Situations at the Eighth and Eleventh Grades," Unpublished M.A. thesis, Boston University, 1950.

ures, it is possible to reconcile these two studies. It is possible that introspective measures of stage fright correlate moderately well with inventory measures of social adjustment, but that the latter might not correlate well with judges' ratings of stage fright. There are no studies in conflict with this hypothesis. Greenleaf found that students leading social lives which they considered limited, also reported high stage fright. Ainsworth's sample of students with both high experienced and high observed stage fright reported having fewer friends. They also displayed more shyness, seclusiveness, withdrawal, and inhibition on various psychological tests. This might well be a function of the self-ratings.

It may be said in general that where introspective accounts of stage fright have been compared with introspective or inventory accounts of social behavior or adjustment, the two have tended to show a relationship. In the one case where inventory measures of social adjustment were compared with observers' judgments of stage fright, the relationship was practically non-existent.

With regard to introversion and emotional adjustment is found the only direct conflict in the findings of these studies. Eckert and Keys, rating college students for degree of poise on a seven-point scale, found no significant correlation between their introversion and averaged judges' ratings of stage fright, or between emotional adjustment and averaged ratings of stage fright. Jones, comparing fifty high and fifty low stage fright students as determined by a seven-point scale of stage fright, found that high stage fright was characterized by more introversion, neuroticism, submissiveness, and low-self-confidence. The difference can hardly be an artifact of the statistical models, since Eckert and Keys' correlations were so low that even quartile comparisons would probably not have yielded significance. It cannot be an artifact of the tests used, since both studies employed the Bernreuter. This conflict leaves in doubt the question whether observed stage fright is related to specific personality traits, such as introversion or submissiveness.

On the other hand, experienced stage fright may well be related to certain specific personality traits. Between above-median and below-median subjects on Taylor's Manifest Anxiety Scale, Clevenger found a large and significant difference in mean PRCS scores.

Others have reported findings in a similar vein which might appear to confirm the Jones finding and negate the Eckert and Keys findings. However, a careful distinction between dimensions of stage fright makes it clear that the findings in these studies are collateral to both the Jones and the Eckert and Keys experiments. The Jones and Eckert and Keys investigations both used judges' ratings of stage fright, while the Low, Gilkinson, and Ainsworth experiments all involved either introspective accounts or mixed measuring devices including introspective accounts.

Gilkinson found that PRCS scores correlated .30 with emotionality on the Minnesota test. Ainsworth found that students rating themselves high in stage fright tended to choose an undesirable emotion to characterize their feelings. When students with high stage fright were compared with students having little stage fright, Low could find no differences in the MMPI categories at the 1% confidence level, but he did find differences in depression and psychaesthenia at the 5% level. Holtzman found that MMPI profiles were significantly related to PRCS scores, but were

not significantly related to judges' ratings.[27] Taken together, these findings suggest the hypothesis that *introspective adjustment inventories bear a moderate inverse relation to experienced stage fright, but not to observed stage fright.*

A possible complicating factor in research into the relationship between experienced stage fright and personality tests is the likelihood that sex differences interact with the relationship. Gilkinson, for example, found that women's scores on the PRCS tend to correlate more closely with most psychological test scores than did men's. Holtzman found that the relationship between PRCS scores and MMPI profiles was somewhat stronger for women than for men. Low's findings, while not quite so clearcut as these, indicate that on the average men's scores correlated more poorly with psychological tests than did women's. The hypothesis is raised that *the relationship between experienced stage fright and personality test scores is similar in nature for both sexes, but is stronger for women than for men.*

Two studies indicate that introspective accounts of stage fright are not related to projective tests of personality. When Shepherd selected high and low stage fright groups by means of PRCS and judges' ratings, he found no significant difference between groups in scores within any of the Rorschach scoring categories.[28] When Iverson compared upper and lower quartiles on the PRCS for differences in TAT scores, he found no difference in general and over-all personality problems. However, both the Shepherd and the Iverson studies suggest that experiments with projective tests might prove fruitful. Iverson's finding that high and low stage fright groups differed in "methods of handling conflicts" seems related to Holtzman's finding that differences in stage fright are characterized by "type rather than amount" of adjustment problem.[29]

Considering only the relationship of stage fright to other factors, probably the least exploited field of research at present is the relationship of various audience variables to the three dimensions of stage fright. Kinsley's report that most experienced speakers say that different audiences have varying effects on them is provocative, but it tells us little about the variables at work which produce such differences. One possible source of variation is simply the familiarity of the audience. Lomas found that changing audiences tended to raise stage fright. Paulson, on the other hand, found that introducing a new audience had no effect on PRCS scores.[30] Of course, until the adaptation curve of the PRCS is known, the real meaning of Paulson's finding remains in doubt. If the rise in PRCS from one speech to another were sufficiently sharp, a constant PRCS from one speech to another might signify a substantial net increase in stage fright. At present, however, an insufficient backlog of evidence exists to allow even tentative hypotheses concerning the relation of stage fright to audience variation.

One of the more provocative experi-

[27] Paul D. Holtzman, "An Experimental Study of Some Relationships Among Several Indices of Stage Fright and Personality Structure," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1950.

[28] John R. Shepherd, "An Experimental Study of the Response of Stage Frightened Students to Certain Scoring Categories of the Group Rorschach Test," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1952.

[29] Norman E. Iverson, "A Descriptive Study of Some Personality Relationships Underlying a Range of Speaker Confidence as Determined by the Thematic Apperception Test," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1952.

[30] Stanley F. Paulson, "Changes in Confidence During a Period of Speech Training: Transfer of Training and Comparison of Improved and Non-Improved Groups on the Bell Adjustment Inventory," Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Minnesota, 1949.

ments concerning the relation of stage fright to other variables was reported by Simon a number of years ago, and was apparently never followed up. Simon reported the finding that stage fright was related to "ability to integrate under stress," as measured by number of errors in a high-speed card sorting task, and that stage-frightened students fell in the middle of a continuum of such ability, between non-frightened students on the one hand and stutterers on the other.[31] The experiment stands alone, and the hypothesis must be subjected to a greater variety of experimental conditions before conclusions can be drawn from it.

Synthesis of stage fright research performed to this time has yielded the following hypotheses:

1. Audience-perceived stage fright, cognitively-experienced stage fright, and physiological disruption are three variables which operate with only moderate interdependence during the course of a public speech.

2. As with other psychological phenomena, groups of judges are able to make judgments of stage fright of an order of reliability varying as a negatively-accelerated monotonic growth function of the number of judges.

3. Either age or training in speech or experience in speaking or some combination of these bears some relation to reliability of judgments of stage fright, but reliability is not a linear function of these factors.

4. Teachers of speech are evidently in stronger agreement concerning what constitutes the absence of stage fright than what constitutes its presence.

5. Between over-all measures of experienced stage fright and observational indices of certain specific behaviors, a positive but very weak relationship prevails.

6. Judges observe stage fright more in men than in women, while women experience more stage fright than men, but the differences in both cases are small.

7. Observed stage fright bears a strong negative relationship to judgments of speaking ability, while experienced stage fright bears a weak negative relationship to judgments of speaking ability.

8. Speaker confidence is a negatively-accelerated monotonic growth function of experience in speaking.

9. Experienced stage fright is a curvilinear decay function of age, the asymptote of the function being approached before age twenty.

10. Introspective adjustment inventories bear a moderate inverse relation to experienced stage fright, but not to observed stage fright.

11. The relationship between experienced stage fright and personality test scores is similar in nature for both sexes, but is stronger for women than for men.

[31] Clarence T. Simon, "Complexity and Breakdown in Speech Situations," *JSHD*, X (1941), 199-203.

THE RHETORIC OF POLITICAL PROTEST

Harry P. Kerr

WHY has the American protest party exerted so little influence on our political thought? Platforms of political protest are not always or in every degree unpalatable to popular opinion. Occasionally parties like the LaFollette Progressives have demonstrated that defeat at the polls does not preclude the possibility of affecting public opinion significantly. Yet most of our protest parties have risen, agitated briefly, and disappeared without having introduced or even modified a single important idea. Some few, like the Greenback Party, live on and on, unnoticed and without influence.

I suggest that this general record of persuasive impotence is due in part to an inherent weakness in the rhetoric of American political protest. Typically the protest party is the fruit of a single idea, an averred solution to some problem facing society. Launching the party in the face of numerous obstacles[1] and a long history of failure requires considerable motivation. One would expect that the motivation not infrequently stems from an intense interest in the party's germinal idea. During its period of gestation, leaders of the party will naturally and inevitably focus special attention on this idea. When they solicit the approval and support of voters, however, they must heed the wants and desires of voters. They must seek topics of discourse, not in the newborn dogma, but in the experience of the electorate. If leaders of the party and their disciples attend only to the germinal idea, they will speak in language that is not meaningful to the voter. Their arguments will probably fall on deaf ears. Their candidate will lose. Their idea will die.

Does my hypothesis fit the facts? Are protest party leaders likely to become so enamored of a single idea or set of closely related ideas that they cannot communicate meaningfully with voters who do not share their convictions? This paper presents the evidence that such a fate befell the Union Party in 1936. The evidence suggests that the Union Party failed to bridge the gulf of voter indifference, not solely or even primarily because of conditions peculiar to it, but rather because of conditions which are common to many parties of political protest.

I.

The Union Party evolved from the National Union for Social Justice (NUSJ), a nation-wide lobbying organization established in 1934 by Father Charles Edward Coughlin. From the NUSJ the Union Party inherited both a leader, Father Coughlin, and a program, reform of the nation's financial machinery.

Coughlin became the most influential man in the Union Party because he was the only figure of national political

Mr. Kerr (M.A., Cornell, 1956) is a Lecturer on Public Speaking at Harvard University. This paper is based on his master's thesis.

[1] Among these obstacles, lack of campaign funds and difficulties in securing a place on the ballots of the several states have been chronic and sometimes decisive. See Louise Overacker, "Campaign Funds in the Presidential Election of 1936," *The American Political Science Review*, XXXI (June 1937), 473-498. Also see *New Republic*, LXXXVII (June 3, 1936), 99-100, for a tabular summary of the election laws of all states as they related to admission of new parties to the ballot in 1936.

power and prominence associated with it. He already presided over the NUSJ (which claimed upwards of eight million members[2]), conducted a weekly radio program on a nation-wide network ("The Golden Hour of the Little Flower"), and published a weekly newspaper with purported circulation of 750,000 (*Social Justice*).[3] William Lemke and Thomas O'Brien, the Union Party's presidential and vice-presidential candidates, were well known only in their home states.[4] Since Coughlin enjoyed control over channels of communication which Lemke and O'Brien needed to conduct their campaign, they could hardly deny him a decisive voice in party affairs.

Although two other men, Dr. Francis E. Townsend and the Reverend Gerald L. K. Smith, are sometimes named with Coughlin as key figures in the Union Party, their importance as Lemke supporters has been much exaggerated.[5] The fact is that neither played a role of any consequence in the campaign and neither exercised any voice in party management. Whereas Coughlin devoted virtually all his time and energy to the Union Party cause, Townsend's support of Lemke was half-hearted at best, and Smith's was insignificant. The pages of Coughlin's newspaper were filled with campaign material from June to November; the *Townsend National Weekly*, on the other hand, did not back Lemke until September 14,[6] and its support thereafter was sporadic.[7] While Coughlin was stumping the country in Lemke's behalf throughout the summer and fall, Townsend urged Lemke's election in but a single speech at Los Angeles on September 4.[8] Even this commitment to Lemke's cause he partially withdrew, for when the Union Party could not secure a place on the ballot in California, Townsend suggested that his followers in that state vote instead for Landon.[9] On November 1, Townsend devoted one short paragraph in an hour-long, national radio broadcast to Lemke and spent the rest of the hour extolling the Townsend plan.[10] Townsend did contribute to the political persuasion offered by the Union Party, but his contributions were lukewarm and infrequent. He was in no sense a partner with Coughlin in directing or purveying the Union Party's program of persuasion.

The role played by Gerald L. K. Smith was even less important. Prior to Huey Long's death Smith had held a key position in the Share Our Wealth movement. By 1936, however, he was a demagogue without a following,[11] busily

[2] *The New York Times*, April 28, 1935, sec. IV, p. 12; hereafter cited as *NYT*.

[3] *Social Justice*, March 13, 1936, p. 1; March 20, 1936, pp. 3 and 7; May 22, 1936, p. 4; hereafter cited as *SJ*.

[4] At the time of the campaign, Lemke represented North Dakota in Congress, and O'Brien, formerly a district attorney in Boston, served as legal counsel for a railroad union.

[5] See, for example, Arthur S. Link, *American Epoch* (New York, 1955), p. 412: "[Lemke ran] on a Union Party ticket supported by Dr. Townsend, Father Coughlin, and Huey Long's successor, the Reverend Gerald L. K. Smith." This statement is misleading with respect to the importance of the roles played by Townsend and Smith. It is incorrect in naming Smith as Long's successor. See note 11, *infra*.

[6] Pp. 1, 8, and 9; hereafter cited as *TNW*.

[7] Lemke's election is urged in *TNW*, September 21, 1936, p. 15; October 5, 1936, p. 8; and October 19, 1936, pp. 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, and 16; but not in the issues for September 28, 1936, or October 12, 1936. The issues for October 26, 1936 (p. 2), and November 2, 1936 (p. 5), carry short statements by Union Party leaders but no word of endorsement by Townsend officials.

[8] *TNW*, September 14, 1936, p. 1.

[9] *TNW*, October 19, 1936, p. 16.

[10] *NYT*, November 2, 1936, p. 11; the text is in *TNW*, November 9, 1936, p. 5.

[11] The statement quoted above (note 5) from Link is wrong in describing Smith as "Huey Long's successor." In the struggle for control of the Louisiana machine which followed Long's death, Smith was squeezed out (*NYT*, February 8, 1936, p. 2), and he subsequently followed policies quite different from those pursued by the new leaders of the Long machine. He did not, for example, take part in the rapproche-

trying to work his way into the Townsend organization or any other group which would provide him with a soapbox.[12] Eventually both Townsend and Coughlin repelled Smith's advances. Among other things, they came to see that Smith's glib talk of being able to deliver six million votes had no basis in fact.[13] In October, Townsend abruptly announced that Smith had been "lopped from the recovery movement" for making pro-fascist statements.[14] Coughlin later said: "I was frightened by Smith . . . a professional anti-Semite, an anti-Christian."[15] Smith supported Lemke on only one public occasion that I can discover—the Townsend National Convention in July.[16] Smith made a good deal of noise and gained considerable newspaper attention in 1936, but his part in the Union Party's campaign was negligible.

Coughlin dominated the Union Party. Townsend was a reluctant aide, Smith a suspected hanger-on, and Lemke and O'Brien, for the most part, figureheads without policy-making authority. In consequence, the economic proposals which Coughlin had championed as president of the NUSJ found their way into the party's campaign platform.

Coughlin believed that the financial troubles of the nation were due largely to the fact that Congress delegated to the Federal Reserve System certain of its powers to coin money and to regulate money and credit. He wrote into the Union Party platform provisions for: 1) establishment of a central bank of issue through which Congress could control fiscal matters directly; and 2) recall of all tax-exempt bonds and certificates of indebtedness issued to Federal Reserve banks by the Treasury.[17]

If they had been mere incidental parts of a well-rounded program, these proposals to alter the banking methods of the Federal Government could have done little harm, although it is doubtful that any political artist could have given them sufficient persuasive appeal to be of great assistance in electing a president. But they were far more than incidental parts of a broad political platform. Central banking and retirement of tax-exempt bonds became the dominant themes of the Union Party's campaign for popular support. In this role they seriously weakened the party's persuasive efforts. How seriously, can be seen by reviewing the party's maldevelopment of the most important issue available to it in 1936—economic recovery and security.

2.

"Recovery" and "security" were without question the most promising passwords to the White House in 1936. Ever since the crash of 1929 and the dark days of 1932 and 1933, recovery or preservation of job, of home, of self-respect had been the omnipresent hope and stimulus to activity in every area of national life. By 1936, to be sure, con-

ment between Washington and Baton Rouge which occurred early in 1936 (*NYT*, February 5, 1936, p. 2). He was still roundly abusing the Administration when the Louisiana delegation to the Democratic National Convention cast a unanimous ballot for Roosevelt. (*NYT*, June 24, 1936, p. 19.)

[12] For evidence of Smith's efforts to insinuate himself into Townsend's favor and of his initial successes, see *NYT*, June 1, 1936, p. 12; June 19, 1936, p. 7; and June 23, 1936, p. 18; and *TNW*, September 28, 1936, p. 7.

[13] *NYT*, June 1, 1936, p. 12.

[14] *TNW*, November 2, 1936, pp. 1 and 2.

[15] *Life*, November 14, 1955, p. 120.

[16] It was on this occasion that Smith was photographed with his arms around the shoulders of Townsend and Coughlin. The picture was widely reproduced at the time (*NYT*, July 17, 1936, p. 6, and *SJ*, July 27, 1936, p. 1) and probably contributed to the myth that this triumvirate of politicians was united under Lemke's banner. The same picture is in *Life*, November 14, 1955, p. 120.

[17] *SJ*, June 29, 1936, p. 15.

ditions were improving. From a low of 58 in 1932, the Federal Reserve Board's "Adjusted Index of Industrial Production" had risen to 104 by the time that the Union Party was launched in June 1936.[18] Still, millions of unemployed—no one knew exactly how many, but conflicting estimates seemed to point toward ten million—were walking the streets; many of them were hungry, all were discontented.[19] Americans had not yet recovered their confidence or their economic security; they were still anxious to hear how economic recovery might be completed.

Here was a ready-made issue with great persuasive potential. The normal concern of voters for their personal well-being was intensified in 1936. If Lemke could convince voters that his election would mean homes, clothes, and food for the "ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished," he would speak to attentive audiences.

But the Union Party was not particularly interested in homes or clothes or food. Despite overwhelming evidence that prospective Lemke supporters were concerned mainly with personal economic recovery, party speakers discussed economics solely in institutional terms. Voters might wear patched trousers and eat watery soup. Lemke urged them to worry about paying a public and private debt which was twice as large as the physical value of all the property in the country.[20] In Massachusetts, New Jersey, Michigan, Illinois, Colorado, Union Party speakers denounced the Roosevelt Administration for trying to create jobs by issuing "billions more of tax-exempt, interest-bearing bonds."[21] They talked more about bonds than jobs. Precisely what was the Union Party objecting to? Here is the central argument which Lemke and his spokesmen harped on all through the summer and fall of 1936. Presumably it was intended to attract votes.

> Time and time again over the radio it has been brought home to the American people that the federal government issues its bonds, which are evidences of debt, and sells these bonds almost exclusively to the banks of the country. These bonds bear interest and become the property of the bank which buys them.
>
> But the banks do not pay for the bonds. Whenever a new billion in bonds is issued the banks have precisely the same number of dollars in cash as they had on the preceding day when they "purchased" the bonds.
>
> All the bank does is to enter upon its ledger a credit to the government of the United States for the face value of those bonds and the government is permitted to draw at will against that credit.
>
> Whenever a banker needs actual money to meet the withdrawals of the government against that credit, all he has to do, under present law, is to load those bonds into a truck and back up to the platform of any Federal Reserve Bank and deposit them, in return for which he receives currency of the United States.
>
> In turn all the Federal Reserve Bank has to do is to ship those bonds to the Treasury of the United States and be reimbursed at their full face value with the clean, crisp currency of the government Bureau of Engraving and Printing.
>
> In other words, the bonds are liquid and they can be converted into cash at the will of the owner, provided that owner is a banker and a member of the Federal Reserve system.

[18] Frederick L. Allen, *Since Yesterday* (New York and London, 1940), p. 222.

[19] Hugh S. Hanna, "Labor," *Americana Annual 1937*, ed. A. H. McDannald and J. B. McDonnell (New York and Chicago, 1937), p. 377, and the same publication for 1938, p. 365. Three contemporary public opinion polls reflect the general feeling of discontent. In October 1935, only thirty-seven per cent of those polled in a national survey indicated they felt more secure than they had a year earlier; and in the following July, only forty per cent of a similar group said they felt personally "better off" than during the past two or three years. Another survey in July revealed that only sixteen per cent of the people felt the depression was over. See Hadley Cantril, ed., *Public Opinion*, 1935-1946 (Princeton, 1951), pp. 173 and 61, respectively.

[20] *SJ*, August 17, 1936, p. 3.

[21] *NYT*, July 5, 1936, p. 19; July 6, 1936, p. 3; *SJ*, August 17, 1936, p. 3.

In the meantime while the bank is using the currency it is drawing interest on the bonds which it still owns.

At what cost does the banker convert a government bond into cash? It is at the cost of the printing of that currency, which averages 30 cents for each $1,000. The cost does not vary with time. The bonds may be left for years but the charge is only for the currency—30 cents per $1,000—irrespective of the time it is used.

Let us consider that there is $3-billion of bonds held by a certain bank and that these bonds draw 3 per cent interest. The bank which invests in this type of property receives a gross income of $90-million a year, and any time that that bank desires the $3-billion in cash it can have the $3-billion in clean, crisp currency for $900,000. In other words, the government pays the bank $90-million a year as interest on $3-billion and then cashes its own bonds for a charge of $900-thousand.[22]

The New York Times thought the Union Party's "assertions and undertakings regarding the currency [were] founded upon complete ignorance or wilful misrepresentation."[23] Most voters probably didn't think about them at all. Alternate methods of funding federal deficits are too remote from the half-empty market basket to command much attention. Because they were so remote from voter interests, the Union Party's economic theories provided a weak basis on which to argue that Lemke could solve voters' problems more satisfactorily than other presidential candidates.

3.

Failure to adapt arguments to the voters' economic interests was not the only flaw in the Union Party's persuasion, but it may be the most profitable one to study. Men less stiff-necked than Lemke and Coughlin might have welcomed Townsend as a collaborator and incorporated his revolving pension fund scheme (or some mutually acceptable variant) into the Union Party's platform. Nothing in Townsend's plan was inconsistent with Union Party dogma, and the dogma sadly needed appealing elements. Coughlin might have curbed his propensity for rash assertions and impolitic attacks against respected persons, thereby conserving the favorable ethos he had enjoyed in June 1936.[24] But these rhetorical blunders resulted from eccentricities of persons accidentally associated with the party. Coughlin's rashness, his and Lemke's lack of enthusiasm for Townsend, and similar kinds of behavior are not inevitable in leaders of a protest movement. On the other hand, the Union Party's lack of audience adaptation seems to have stemmed directly from a condition necessary to this party's formation.

Consider what might have caused Union Party leaders to argue only in terms of "impersonal" economic problems. That they possessed at least a general understanding of the wants, needs, interests, and desires of the electorate is evidenced by numerous statements made during the campaign and by mention in the party platform of many of the problems confronting society.[25] Coughlin's

[22] *SJ*, May 29, 1936, p. 12.
[23] August 17, 1936, p. 18.

[24] Coughlin described Roosevelt as "anti-God" (*NYT*, September 26, 1936, p. 1), a "scab President" (*NYT*, October 27, 1936, p. 14), and "the great betrayer and liar" (*NYT*, July 17, 1936, p. 6). In consequence of these and other foolhardy statements made during the campaign, he was publicly rebuked by his immediate superior, Bishop Michael J. Gallagher (*NYT* July 19, 1936, p. 1), by Archbishop John T. McNicholas (*NYT*, September 26, 1936, pp. 1 and 3), and by the official Vatican newspaper, *Osservatore Romano* (*NYT*, September 3, 1936, p. 1; September 10, 1936, p. 5).

[25] The Union Party platform recognized, for example, that there was public interest in avoiding foreign entanglements, in "a living annual wage," "production at a profit for the farmer," "security for the aged," tariff protection for American industry, adequate military forces, reduction of the power and activities of the federal government, an augmented civil service program, federal conservation programs, etc. (*SJ*, June 29, 1936, p. 15.) But no believable method of accomplishing these diverse and, indeed, contradictory aims was advanced.

successful organization of the NUSJ and Lemke's election to Congress testify to their competence as practical politicians, capable of using rhetorical techniques effectively and of making the adjustments and compromises which success in practical politics demands.[26] Finally, the fact that Coughlin and Lemke were successful politicians makes it difficult to believe that they were unwilling to adopt any reasonable measures which might mitigate the crushing defeat to which the campaign was leading the Party.[27] If the requisite understanding, ability, and willingness were not lacking, what prevented party leaders from identifying the need for fiscal reforms with the chicken which was not in every voter's pot? Only one explanation remains. They did not think it was necessary. Coughlin and Lemke were so convinced of the importance of central banking and recall of tax-exempt bonds that they could not believe the voter might not share their views.

There is additional evidence that leaders of the party were blind to the limitations of their key proposal. Reform of monetary institutions was, to be sure, a remote solution for immediate personal economic problems, but it was at least vaguely relevant. The Union Party went on, however, to advocate this solution also for problems with which it had no discernible connection. Party speakers proclaimed financial reform as the panacea which would increase opportunities for employment, augment farm income, keep the United States out of international alliances, and even rid the government of Communists! Persistent concentration on a single proposal, apparently without any consideration of which public problems it could be shown likely to alleviate, strongly suggests that party leaders could not divert their attention from financial reform long enough to appraise its persuasive potentialities objectively. They were unable to consider realistically the problems which really troubled voters and the relationships between these problems and the party's proffered solution to them. Lacking this objective appraisal of their single main proposal, they were not able to perceive the necessity for audience adaptation.

The Union Party carried the seeds of its defeat from the moment of its inception, for the same intense interest which impelled Coughlin and Lemke to launch the party prevented them from seeing what had to be done to attract supporters. But more than the election was lost in this fashion. A politician can lose an election and still modify existing ideas and institutions. Townsend got no closer to the White House than a Congressional investigating committee which cut him to ribbons, but he won at least partial victory in the passage of Social Security legislation. When Lemke lost, the Union Party disintegrated, and talk about central banking and recall of tax-exempt bonds ended. The party disappeared without perceptibly influencing the development of American political thought.

I suggest that the party's lack of au-

[26] Franklin D. Roosevelt testified to Coughlin's persuasive powers in 1935 in a letter to Elihu Root concerning the World Court issue: "The deluge of letters, telegrams, Resolutions of Legislatures, and the radio talks of people like Coughlin turned the trick against us." Franklin D. Roosevelt, *F. D. R. His Personal Letters 1928-1945*, ed. Elliott Roosevelt (New York, 1950), I, 451.

[27] As is true of so many other aspects of this campaign, Union Party leaders seem to have been unaware of the magnitude of the defeat which they were to receive at the polls. In August, Coughlin promised an audience at the NUSJ national convention that he would retire from radio broadcasting and political activity if Lemke did not receive nine million votes. Lemke polled only 882,479 ballots, and Coughlin (temporarily) retired. *NYT*, August 16, 1936, p. 27; November 4, 1936, p. 5; November 8, 1936, p. 32; November 12, 1936, p. 12.

dience adaptation was primarily responsible for this failure to modify existing ideas. Weaknesses in ethical appeal, or style, or cogency decrease the probability that an audience will accept a speaker's proposal, but they do not, in themselves, prevent the proposal from having meaning for the audience. The meaningfulness of a proposition for a given auditor depends chiefly on the relation between the proposition and those matters which are of immediate and pressing concern to him. When a proposition is well adapted to audience needs and desires, it may be unacceptable but capable of influencing audience thinking. The person who questioned the motives and deplored the methods of the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy could reject the Senator's proposals and still be influenced by the general proposition that Communist subversion constituted a grave threat to national security. But if a proposition is not adapted to audience wants and desires, its viability derives only from the speaker. Such a proposition really has no meaning for an audience and little chance of influencing their thinking.

The preoccupation with fiscal problems which presumably produced the Union Party came in the end to be a sufficient cause of its demise. Leaders of the party, and Coughlin in particular, were so obsessed by their desire for remote and complex economic reforms that they did not perceive the necessity of relating these reforms to the hopes and fears of 1936. No rhetorical tactics could have placed Lemke in the White House, of course; but by persistently harping on financial abstractions before an audience uninterested in coinage, funding, and credit control, the speakers assured his overwhelming defeat and condemned to oblivion the ideas which his party had championed.

What has been said of the Union Party's incapacity to discover political arguments in the thoughts and desires of its audience, of its exclusive concern with doctrine which formed the "party line," may, perhaps, be said of other protest groups as well. The Progressive Party of 1948 limited its choice of argumentative propositions to a considerable degree to those consistent with official Communist doctrine.[28] Rhetorical analysis of such other protest parties as the Greenbacks, Populists, and Free Silver Democrats might provide similar evidence that their leadership was too engrossed in party dogma to evaluate its persuasive possibilities objectively. A party thus limited in outlook would almost inevitably appeal to voters in terms unrelated to their personal interests. Regardless of other persuasive successes or failures, such a party would not only fail to attract voters' support; it would also fail to make any significant impression on voters' minds. The Union Party in 1936 and the Progressive Party in 1948 committed this particular kind of rhetorical suicide. Further investigation may reveal this as one of the reasons so many other American protest parties lie today in unmarked graves.

[28] Forbes I. Hill, "A Rhetorical Study of the Speaking of Henry Agard Wallace from 1946 to 1948" (unpubl. Master's Thesis, University of Oregon, 1955), esp. pp. 254-255.

A PHILOSOPHY FOR RHETORIC FROM BERTRAND RUSSELL

Donald L. Torrence

IN *QJS* for April 1955 Maurice Natanson seems to request that rhetoricians again wed themselves to philosophical inquiry before they propose a system of rhetoric.[1] If such inquiry is conducted, the nature and function of rhetoric will be clear, and the system of rhetoric proposed will be based upon sound foundations.

As a start in the direction Natanson suggests I have investigated the results of the philosophical inquiry conducted by the English philosopher Bertrand Russell. The presentation of Russell's views on rhetoric serves two purposes. Russell has not offered his views on rhetoric in any one work. His comments which are of interest to the rhetorician are scattered amongst his fifty-odd books. Therefore, the first purpose is to reveal in collected form the views and comments on rhetoric made by an eminent contemporary philosopher. Second, the hypotheses presented here might be useful in further dialectical discussion and, thus, lead to a sounder philosophical basis for rhetoric.

Some difficulty is encountered in using Russell as the basis for a sound philosophy of rhetoric, for when he uses the word "rhetoric," Russell usually means sham and artifice. For example, he asks, "I can make this speech, with such embellishments as my rhetorical skill suggests, but will it carry conviction to my interlocutor?"[2] Further, he points out, "There have been in the past eminent orators and writers who defended, with an appearance of great wisdom, positions which no one now holds: the reality of witchcraft, the beneficence of slavery, and so on"; of these persons he would ". . . cause the young to appreciate at once their rhetoric and their wrong-headedness."[3] Although sham and artifice are condemned at every turn, Russell, like Plato in the *Phaedrus*, does present views which form the fundamentals of a sound system of rhetoric. My plan is to present a concept of rhetoric which does not exclude sound persuasion, then to examine what Russell has had to say about the elements within this concept.

Briefly, I assume that rhetoric is primarily concerned with the influence that words may have upon the behavior, mental or physical, of men. This concept recognizes that man is not the only user of symbols—dogs, for example, may indicate their desires by certain gestures —but the rhetorician is primarily interested in man's indications. It further admits that man may use various means of signifying: a man's dress, the auto he drives, the flag he waves, the music he plays, "all sorts of things may be signs of other things, but," as Russell says, "with human beings words are the supreme example of signs."[4] This concept

Mr. Torrence (Ph.D., University of Illinois, 1957) is Instructor in Speech at Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois.

[1] "The Limits of Rhetoric," *QJS*, XLI (1955), 134.

[2] Bertrand Russell, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics* (London, 1954), p. 81.

[3] Bertrand Russell, *Power: A New Social Analysis* (London, 1938), p. 314.

[4] Bertrand Russell, *An Outline of Philosophy* (London, 1927), p. 85.

also recognizes that the language of words may do other than influence; words may be used as a vehicle of thought, they may ask for information, etc., but the function of language which most concerns the rhetorician is the function of influence. In the milieu of social life man, sometimes from necessity, sometimes from desire, attempts to influence the behavior of other men through the use of language. This process is the rhetorician's main concern. He may be interested in such things as gestures, ensigns, and the right management of the toga, but only as they are conjoined with the purposive, social function of the language of words.

From this concept of rhetoric it becomes evident that there are three elements which constitute the fundamentals of a system of rhetoric, namely, man, particularly as the object of influence, language, as the medium of influence, and society, which provides the ethical environment for the rhetorical process. Therefore, I shall present first Russell's general views as to the nature of man, the nature of language, and the nature of society; then, I shall show how Russell uses this philosophical background to illumine the rhetorical process as defined above. That is, I shall present Russell's answers to the questions: How does language influence man's behavior? And how should language be used to influence man's behavior?

1.

A. MAN. In discussing man's nature it is first necessary to explain his place in the universe as Russell sees it. To him, man is just one of many events in the universe, with no particular cosmic significance except that which man assigns to himself. Nor is it inevitable that the universe will progress in a manner favorable to man, as Russell explains in his essay, "A Free Man's Worship":

> That man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving; that his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and his beliefs, are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought and feeling, can preserve an individual life beyond the grave; that all the labours of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noonday brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and that the whole temple of Man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the debris of a universe in ruins—all these things, if not quite beyond dispute, are yet so nearly certain, that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand.[5]

Nevertheless Russell thinks that man can and should strive to make his will prevail in this disinterested, if not hostile, environment. Particularly in the realm of ethics—that is, in man's relation to man—can man's desires be made to prevail. And within this realm rhetoric falls.

Man as an event in the universe is differentiated from other events in several important ways, but in his purely physical life and in his primitive impulses and passions man differs little from the higher mammals:

> Man differs from other higher mammals in various ways, in all of which, man being the judge, it is thought men are superior to other animals. The differences are not much concerned with the congenital apparatus of impulse and passion. . . . It is not in the raw material of passion and impulse that human beings are peculiar in the animal kingdom, but in certain broad capacities which may be grouped under two heads as those belonging to intelligence and those belonging to imagination.[6]

Because of his imagination man can combine already known elements into countless objectives; man's desires, unlike those of animals, are boundless. And because he can exercise intelligence,

[5] Bertrand Russell, *Mysticism and Logic and Other Essays* (London, 1917), pp. 47-48.

[6] Russell, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*, p. 175.

man is able to control his primitive impulses and passions and rise above animals in his behavior.

In Russell's scheme of things there are two general characteristics of man which lead to concepts of especial interest to the rhetorician. First, man is basically an animal endowed with impulsive and passionate behavior not unlike that of animals. Second, man possesses certain characteristics that are peculiarly human, namely, intelligence and imagination; these can lead to behavior which is distinctively human. Since the rhetorician is concerned with how man's behavior is influenced, he must be concerned with the causes of man's behavior. The two general characteristics of man presented above lead Russell to postulate two specific kinds of causes of man's behavior, namely, desires (akin to animals) and beliefs (distinctively human).

Desire in its primitive form is a stimulus away from discomfort. An animal which becomes hungry has certain unpleasant sensations which cause bodily movements likely to lead to a cessation of the unpleasantness. When the sensations are quieted, desire no longer exists. Of course, "when an animal is reflective, like some men, it comes to think that it had the final situation in mind throughout; sometimes it comes to know what situation will bring satisfaction."[7] When the goal becomes thus defined, it is no longer a primitive desire but has become a conscious desire. If the goal is ill-defined and, in fact, will not bring about a cessation of the unpleasant feelings, the desire is called secondary: "These mistaken beliefs generate secondary desires, which cause various interesting complications in the psychology of human desire, without fundamentally altering the character which it shares with animal desire."[8] Desires of the nature described are, in Russell's opinion, a primary cause of human behavior, for he states, "When I say that each man seeks the satisfaction of his own desires, I am expressing a truism: all our acts, except those which are purely reflex, are inspired, of necessity, by our own desires."[9]

From man's peculiarly human characteristics Russell draws the other class of causes of behavior, namely, beliefs. In virtue of his intelligence man is able to inhibit or control the raw behavior prompted by desire:

> Belief . . . is the central problem in the analysis of mind. Believing seems the most "mental" thing we do, the most remote from what is done by mere matter. The whole intellectual life consists of beliefs, and of the passage from one belief to another by what is called "reasoning." Beliefs give knowledge and error; they are the vehicles of truth and falsehood.[10]

To Russell a belief is "that way of being conscious which may be either true or false."[11] Belief is a psychological state of the organism, but this state has a referent which is usually outside the organism, namely, an event of the universe. It is by virtue of the relation between the belief (the state of the organism) and what is believed (the fact or event of the universe) that the belief may be called true or false. Russell thinks that "the content of belief, when expressed in words, is the same thing (or very nearly the same thing) as what in logic is called a 'proposition'."[12] Although belief and desire are both psychological states of an organism, they differ in at least one important respect. When a desire is expressed in words it

[7] Bertrand Russell, *The Analysis of Mind* (London, 1921), p. 68.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[9] Russell, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*, p. 56.

[10] Russell, *The Analysis of Mind*, p. 231.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 240-241.

would be in the optative mood, and although it might be called right or correct in a moral or ethical sense, it cannot, like beliefs, which are in the indicative mood, be called true or false in a logical sense.

Desire and belief, of course, are not the only possible causes of human behavior. There is a whole group of what Russell calls "propositional attitudes" which may prompt behavior: disbelief, doubt, disjunction, etc. But Russell does not discuss any of these in detail, probably because desire and belief are typical of the possible propositional attitudes.

Before concluding the discussion of man's nature, one question remains to be answered: "How far are beliefs operative as causes of actions"[13] in comparison to desires? Although one cannot separate behavior into definite categories of desire and belief, some general conclusions may be drawn. "The mind of the most rational among us may be compared to a stormy ocean of passionate convictions based upon desire, upon which float perilously a few tiny boats carrying a cargo of scientifically tested belief."[14] Russell concludes, however, that "although beliefs are not directly responsible for more than a small part of our actions, the actions for which they are responsible are among the most important, and largely determine the general structure of our lives."[15]

In summary, Russell believes that man exists in a universe which is, at best, cold to man's purposes. The points which distinguish man from other events in the universe are more of degree than of kind. Thus man is closely related to animals, and in his primitive behavior there is little to distinguish his actions from those of animals. The most human element in man's behavior comes from his intelligence and imagination. Man's behavior, Russell finds, arises from two primary causes: desires, which are akin to animal behavior, and beliefs, which are distinctively human traits.

B. LANGUAGE. Before we can discuss the problem of how, according to Russell, language as the medium of rhetorical influence causes desires and beliefs in men, we must examine the philosopher's concept of language. According to him, language deserves a place of high esteem in the affairs of man: "We may say . . . without exaggeration, that language is a human prerogative, and probably the chief habit in which we are superior to 'dumb' animals."[16] The entire development and transmission of skills would be impossible without language. In addition, abstract concepts and elaborate thoughts would be unlikely without some form of language. Therefore, "It is, of course, obvious that unless one thing can be the sign of another both science and daily life would be impossible."[17]

In the fact that one thing can be the sign of another lies the essence of language. And of the possible means of signification "words are the supreme example, since their effects as signs are prodigious, while their intrinsic interest as sensible occurrences on their own account is usually very slight."[18]

Let us now examine what Russell says about words as the basic units of language. Words are, first of all, physical occurrences in the realm of sensible experience, but they differ from other sensations in that a meaning is per-

[13] Bertrand Russell, *Sceptical Essays* (London, 1935), p. 17.
[14] Bertrand Russell, *The Scientific Outlook* (London, 1931), p. 16.
[15] Russell, *Sceptical Essays*, p. 19.
[16] Russell, *An Outline of Philosophy*, p. 47.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 279.
[18] Russell, *The Analysis of Mind*, p. 293.

ceived in verbal sensations. The perception of meaning is a subjective act learned in accordance with the law of association or conditioned reflex. When the word "bottle" is uttered often enough in the presence of a bottle, the child will soon associate the two and the word will symbolize or mean the thing. In this view words and their meaning are no more than a product of habit:

> True, we talk a great deal, and imagine that in so doing we are showing that we can think; but behaviorists say that the talk they have to listen to can be explained without supposing that people think. Where you might expect a chapter on "thought processes" you come instead upon a chapter on "The Language Habit." It is humiliating to find how terribly adequate this hypothesis turns out to be.[19]

For words that are more abstract, such as the logical words "true," "not," "or," the meaning is learned in a more complex manner than for words which symbolize things, but meaning is still a product of conditioned reflex. Here the law of association applies not to physical things, such as the bottle, but to experience. Take the case of "or":

> You cannot show a child examples of it in the sensible world. You can say: "will you have pudding or pie?" but if the child says yes, you cannot find a nutriment which is "pudding-or-pie." And yet "or" has a relation to experience; it is related to the experience of choice.[20]

We may conclude, then, that, according to Russell, words ultimately have subjective definition in terms of experience, or they have no meaning. The heart of subjective meaning consists in acquiring learned reactions or conditioned reflexes. But for any form of language to fulfill its function as a medium of communication it must go beyond subjective meaning and attain a measure of objectivity. Russell thinks one method by which this is accomplished is by making words general: "No words exist for describing the actual occurrence in all its particularity; all words, even proper names, are general. . . . When you translate the occurrence into words, you are making generalizations and inferences."[21] The generalizations and inferences that are made add up to a process of extracting from an occurrence or experience those elements which are most likely to be the same for all observers. It is in this manner that language objectifies subjective experience. Words go beyond subjective meaning in yet another respect, namely, by maintaining some measure of constancy in their meanings: "whatever else may be in perpetual flux, the meanings of words must be fixed, at least for a time, since otherwise no assertion is definite, and no assertion is true rather than false. There must be *something* more or less constant, if discourse and knowledge are to be possible."[22]

Single words alone are not sufficient to carry out the complex functions of language; these functions are served by gathering words into sentences. What is a sentence? Russell describes it as follows:

> It may be a single word, or, more usually, a number of words put together according to the laws of syntax; but what distinguishes it is that it expresses something of the nature of an assertion, a denial, an imperative, a desire, or a question. What is more remarkable about a sentence is that we can understand what it expresses if we know the meaning of its several words and the rules of syntax.[23]

Russell confines his discussions of language to indicative sentences since his discussions are generally epistemological. He does this because only indicative

[19] Russell, *The Analysis of Mind*, p. 27.
[20] Bertrand Russell, *An Inquiry Into Meaning and Truth* (London, 1940), p. 73.
[21] Russell, *An Outline of Philosophy*, p. 12.
[22] Bertrand Russell, *A History of Western Philosophy* (London, 1946), p. 174.
[23] Russell, *An Inquiry Into Meaning and Truth*, p. 12.

sentences can be true or false and, hence, yield knowledge. However, this does not thwart the investigation which is concerned with rhetoric:

> We may say, generally, that speech consists, with some exceptions, of noises made by persons with a view to causing desired actions by other persons. Its indicative and assertive capacities, however, remain fundamental, since it is owing to them that, when we hear speech, it can cause us to act in a manner appropriate to some feature of the environment which is perceived by the speaker but not by the hearer, or which the speaker remembers from past experience.[24]

Thus, if it is the indicative or assertive capacity of a sentence which causes behavioral responses in its hearer, it is this capacity which most concerns the rhetorician.

Like words, indicative sentences also have meaning, or as Russell prefers to call it, significance. What a sentence signifies, or means, he calls a proposition: "If we can decide what is meant by the 'significance' of a sentence, we shall say that it is this significance that is to be called a 'proposition,' and that is either true or false."[25] A proposition, in turn, has two sides—a subjective side and an objective side:

> Subjectively, it "expresses" a state of the speaker which may be called a "belief," which may exist without words, and even in animals and infants who do not possess language. Objectively, the assertion, if true, "indicates" a fact; if false, it intends to "indicate" a fact, but fails to do so.[26]

From this analysis of sentences Russell derives his concept of truth. Truth, to him, depends upon the relation of what is asserted or indicated by a sentence (the proposition) to the fact or event of the universe about which the assertion is made. Truth and falsehood are properties of propositions and of beliefs, for beliefs are propositional when verbalized. The facts or events of the universe are not true or false: "there are true and false propositions, but not true and false facts."[27] Truth, in this view, is a product of man, for if the facts of the universe are neither true nor false, only statements made about these facts can be called true or false. Therefore, we see that Russell's concept of truth is closely bound up with his concept of language.

For the rhetorician Russell's idea of language yields several significant concepts. First, words and their meaning are the product of habit; therefore, a response to a word, or language in general, may be a habitual response rather than an intellectual one. Second, it is the indicative or assertive capacity of language which influences the behavior of the listener. Finally, this influential capacity of language can be labelled true or false in relation to a referent in the universe.

C. Society. Russell's concept of society and its function is not new, for he follows closely the concept of a utilitarian philosophy. As to the aim of the best form of life Russell would feel that the satisfaction of an individual's desires is the ultimate aim. However, "self-realization cannot be the supreme principle of ethics,"[28] if social life is to survive, because the desires of different individuals often come into conflict. Therefore, if we assume social life to be desirable, "The fundamental problem of ethics and politics is that of finding some way of reconciling the needs of social life with the urgency of individual desires."[29] The aim of the best form of human social life would be, to

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 27.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 176.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 171.
[27] Russell, *The Analysis of Mind*, p. 272.
[28] Russell, *A History of Western Philosophy*, p. 710.
[29] Bertrand Russell, *Unpopular Essays* (New York, 1950), p. 3.

Russell, the realization of the greatest possible number of individual desires while maintaining social harmony.

In order to realize this best form of life Russell would assign two primary functions to ethical or moral codes, i.e., to society. The first of these functions is negative. Russell defines "freedom" as "the absence of external obstacles to the realization of desires."[30] And it is the function of society to insure each individual the greatest amount of freedom to satisfy his desires that is compatible with the maintenance of a stable social structure. The second function of society is positive, namely, to promote among individuals those desires which are most beneficial and valuable. Russell classifies men's desires into three categories: first, those which are concerned with private ownership including the satisfaction of biological wants and needs; second, desires for fame, power, riches, etc.; and third, desires which can be satisfied independent of conflict with other persons, such as the desires for love, friendship, knowledge, etc. Since Russell believes that the necessities of life are sufficiently abundant, the only problem involved in the satisfaction of the first kind of desire is one of production and distribution. The second class of desire creates much conflict in daily life, since, logically, such desires cannot be satisfied for every person. Not everyone can own the largest house in town, or be the richest person, or be president of the P.T.A. Here Russell would feel that society has an obligation either to change such desires or to channel them into harmless pursuits. By means of education those desires which overtly conflict with social harmony can and should be changed or diminished. If conflicting desires cannot be changed or if it would not be desirable to do so, they may be channeled into other pursuits. For example, "The desire for power . . . should be directed towards power over things rather than power over people."[31] Of the third class of desires, those which involve no conflict of interest, Russell believes that society should actively foster their satisfaction. Every person can enjoy the possession of as much knowledge as he desires, he can enjoy the beauty of nature to any degree he wishes without conflicting with the same kind of enjoyment by others. Not only do these forms of desire-satisfaction present no conflict, but to Russell they are the most pleasant kind of desires and afford the greatest measure of personal satisfaction.

In short, society must strive toward the goal of the best form of social life. It cannot leave the attainment to chance. And it would seem that rhetoric would be the most desirable means of accomplishing Russell's end, since he disavows the use of force. Rhetoric bears a central responsibility in the achievement of ethical social ends, namely, to change or channel certain existing desires (often called human nature) and to promote beneficial desires.

2.

With this philosophical background we turn now to an examination of Russell's ideas concerning the rhetorical process itself. We will discuss, first, how Russell believes language does influence behavior, and second, how he thinks language ought to be used to influence behavior.

As has been pointed out, man's behavior is caused by desires and beliefs. Desires are most like animal behavior, and beliefs are peculiarly human. At this point we must carry this distinction a step further, for Russell discusses two

[30] Russell, *Sceptical Essays*, p. 169.

[31] Russell, *An Outline of Philosophy*, p. 243.

avenues of influence which language may take, the rational and the non-rational (or irrational, since he seems to use the two words synonymously). On the one hand "rationality . . . will consist in basing our beliefs as regards matters of fact upon evidence rather than upon wishes, prejudices, or traditions,"[32] while on the other hand "it may be laid down broadly that irrationalism, i.e., disbelief in objective fact, arises almost always from the desire to assert something for which there is no evidence, or to deny something for which there is very good evidence."[33] In short, it may be said that "a man is rational in proportion as his intelligence informs and controls his desires."[34] We see, then, that rational behavior is that behavior which is prompted by the human factors of man, i.e., beliefs based upon evidence, while non-rational behavior is prompted by the animal factors of his being, i.e., by desires and by beliefs not founded in evidence.

Let us now examine how language influences the non-rational behavior of man.[35] First, desires, or emotions which are closely related to desires, can be influenced directly by language, for, as Russell points out, the law of conditioned reflex "applies both to muscles and glands; it is because it applies to glands that words are capable of causing emotions."[36] Emotions and desires, then, may be influenced directly by words calling up habitual associations. Second, when language is used to create beliefs as to what an individual desires, non-rational behavior usually results. According to Russell, "Conscious desire is made up partly of what is essential to desire, partly of beliefs as to what we want."[37] Therefore, "a belief that something is desired has often a tendency to cause the very desire that is believed in."[38] For example, one must admit that the desire for personal survival is a fundamental desire; yet in time of war a sizable amount of language is expended in leading people to believe that this desire is unimportant and that other desires, preservation of country, guaranteeing of certain privileges to posterity, etc., must take precedence—all this regardless of what rational evidence might point to, one way or the other. And so it is that non-rational behavior is prompted by desire, and desire can be influenced either directly by words or indirectly by creating beliefs as to what an individual does, in fact, desire.

We turn now to an examination of how beliefs are influenced by language. But we are not yet ready to leave the discussion of non-rational behavior, for although beliefs are, generally speaking, more characteristic of rational behavior, beliefs can cause non-rational behavior. Russell observes that "belief, when it is not simply traditional, is a product of several factors: desire, evidence, and iteration."[39] Here are the essential elements necessary to create or influence

[32] Russell, *Sceptical Essays*, p. 48.
[33] *Ibid.*
[34] *Ibid.*, p. 53.
[35] Of course, Russell admits that language is not necessary to cause non-rational behavior. This is particularly true when men gather in large crowds: "What is essential in mass psychology is the art of persuasion. If you compare a speech of Hitler's with a speech of (say) Edmund Burke, you will see what strides have been made in the art since the eighteenth century. What went wrong formerly was that people had read in books that man is a rational animal, and framed their arguments on this hypothesis. We now know that limelight and a brass band do more to persuade than can be done by the most elegant train of syllogisms." (Russell, *The Impact of Science on Society* [London, 1952], p. 42.) Russell is, of course, using the term "persuasion" in a different sense from that intended by the definition of rhetoric in this study, for he includes non-verbal persuasion.
[36] Russell, *An Outline of Philosophy*, p. 84.
[37] Russell, *The Analysis of Mind*, p. 67.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 72.
[39] Russell, *Power: A New Social Analysis*, p. 144.

beliefs in others: iteration (or assertion), evidence (or facts) to support the assertion (whether stated by the speaker or not), and a desire in the hearer to believe the assertion and what it asserts. These elements may exist in varying degrees; for example, if evidence is lacking, iteration may well make up the deficit, but all are essential in some degree to produce belief.

Let us take iteration first. Russell tells us that "man is a credulous animal, and must believe *something*; in the absence of good grounds for belief he will be satisfied with bad ones."[40] Thus because of his nature man is ready to believe any assertion he hears. Such innocence is not always the case, but basically it is so. And belief based primarily on iteration is non-rational by definition, since it does not take into account relevant evidence.

However, iteration must be coupled with the second element of belief, an appeal to existing desire. "Propaganda is only successful when it is in harmony with something in the patient: his desire for an immortal soul, for health, for greatness of his nation, or what not. Where there is no such fundamental reason for acquiescence, the assertions of authority are viewed with cynical scepticism."[41] Russell explains the influence of desire on belief in the following manner:

> . . . the process, reduced to its bare formula, is this: if a certain proposition is true, I shall be able to realize my desires; therefore I wish this proposition to be true; therefore, unless I have exceptional intellectual self-control, I believe it to be true. Orthodoxy and a virtuous life, I am told, will enable me to go to heaven when I die; there is pleasure in believing this, and therefore I shall probably believe it if it is forcibly presented to me. The cause of belief, here, is not, as in science, the evidence of fact, but the pleasant feelings derived from belief, together with sufficient vigour of assertion.[42]

Once again non-rational behavior is the product of belief based upon desire, for evidence plays little part in arriving at such a belief.

It appears, then, that language can bring about non-rational behavior in four ways: (1) by directly causing emotions or desires to arise in individuals, (2) by creating desires through causing a person to believe that he does desire a particular end or object, (3) by causing belief primarily on the basis of iteration, and (4) by causing belief primarily on the basis of desire.

An examination of how Russell believes language may influence rational behavior reveals that there is only one way it can be done. Because beliefs are, or can be, based upon evidence, man is capable of rational behavior. As was pointed out earlier, Russell defines rationality as the process of basing beliefs on evidence rather than upon desire. Therefore, man's rational behavior may be influenced by language when a proposition or belief asserted has a basis in evidence. If the proposition or belief asserted has no basis in evidence, then man, by a conscious effort, may overcome the impulse to believe and behave rationally by disbelieving. A belief, then, is rational in proportion to the degree that evidence is the cause for holding the belief asserted, and a belief is non-rational in proportion to the degree that iteration or desire is the primary cause for holding the belief asserted.

Before concluding the discussion of the influence of language on the behavior of man, there is an additional question that should be considered. As stated earlier, for Russell only a small portion of man's behavior is actually based on rational grounds, and he sug-

[40] Russell, *Unpopular Essays*, p. 99.
[41] Russell, *Power: A New Social Analysis*, pp. 145-146.
[42] *Ibid.*, p. 144.

gests that, perhaps, more ought to be. But how far would it be possible for man to extend his rational behavior? Recall Russell's definition of rationality: "basing our beliefs *as regards matters of fact* upon evidence"[43] rather than upon desire. What matters are there other than those of fact? To Russell, questions of value or ethics lie outside the realm of fact and pure rationality:

> Consider various views as to the ends of life. One man says "the good is pleasure"; another, "the good is pleasure for Aryans and pain for Jews"; another, "the good is to praise God and glorify Him for ever." What are these three men asserting, and what methods exist by which they can convince each other? They cannot, as men of science do, appeal to facts: no facts are relevant to the dispute. Their difference is in the realm of desire, not in the realm of statements about matters of fact.[44]

There is a realm of desire where facts do not operate, the realm of value or ethics: "There are no facts of ethics."[45] To illustrate his point Russell constructs a rather lengthy conversation in which Nietzsche and Buddha appear before the Almighty and attempt to convince Him of the kind of world He should create. Nietzsche's thesis is that the world should contain pain and suffering since great sufferings are noble. Buddha's thesis is that the world should be filled with love for this is the path to salvation.

> For my part [Russell says] I agree with Buddha as I have imagined him. But I do not know how to prove that he is right by any arguments such as can be used in a mathematical or a scientific question. I dislike Nietzsche because he likes the contemplation of pain, because he erects conceit into duty, because the men whom he most admires are conquerors, whose glory is cleverness in causing men to die. But I think the ultimate argument against his philosophy, as against any unpleasant but internally self-consistent ethic, lies not in an appeal to facts, but an appeal to the emotions.[46]

Such assertions as Nietzsche and Buddha would make are in their syntactical form propositions and can be labeled true or false. Theoretically, at least, we might know what evidence would be necessary to prove the truth or falsity of these propositions, but in reality such evidence does not exist or is undiscoverable or undemonstrable. But such questions must be settled because they are relevant and necessary to practical human affairs, and the only method that can be used to settle them is by appeal to emotions or desires. In light of this division Russell postulates two classes of propositions or arguments, ethical argument and intellectual or scientific argument:

> It follows that ethical argument, when it is not merely as to the best means to a given end, differs from scientific argument in being addressed to the emotions, however it may disguise itself by use of the indicative mood. It must not be supposed that, on this account, ethical argument is impossible; it is as easy, if not easier, to influence emotions by argument as to influence intellectual convictions. The difficulty that will be felt is that, in intellectual argument, there is supposed to be a standard of impersonal truth to which we are appealing, while in ethics, on the above view, there appears to be no such standard.[47]

In answer to the question of how far it is possible, in Russell's mind, for man to base his behavior on rational grounds we see that " 'Reason' has a perfectly precise meaning. It signifies the choice of the right means to an end that you wish to achieve. It has nothing whatever to do with the choice of ends."[48] Ethical argument is concerned with ends, the truth of which are not discoverable or demonstrable. Scientific argument, on

[43] Russell, *Sceptical Essays*, p. 48. (Italic mine).
[44] Russell, *Power: A New Social Analysis*, pp. 256-257.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 257.
[46] Russell, *A History of Western Philosophy*, p. 800.
[47] Russell, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*, p. 88.
[48] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

the other hand, is addressed to means for which there are facts to demonstrate truth or falsity. Both kinds of argument are possible and, in fact, necessary to normal human conduct.

Since both desire and rational belief do influence behavior, and since both are necessary to integrated human activity, Russell postulates the following credo of persuasion:

> If, in the name of Reason, you summon a man to alter his fundamental purposes—to pursue, say, the general happiness rather than his own power—you will fail, and you will deserve to fail, since reason alone cannot determine the ends of life. And you will fail equally if you attack deep-seated prejudices while your argument is still open to question, or is so difficult that only men of science can see its force. But if you can prove, by evidence which is convincing to every sane man who takes the trouble to examine it, that you possess a means of facilitating the satisfaction of existing desires, you may hope, with a certain degree of confidence, that men will ultimately believe what you say.[49]

Let us turn, now, from the analysis of how influence by language does occur, to an examination of Russell's views of how language ought to be used to influence behavior, that is, to his ethical code for persuasion. The first consideration is whether or not Russell would feel that influencing the behavior of others is in itself ethical. He seems to consider such influence a matter of course in human affairs; for example, he advocates that individuals be influenced in the kind of desires they hold. It is not the act of influencing others, but the method and purpose of the act that come under his ethical scrutiny. And it is in this area that Russell proposes suggestions or rules for the ethical use of language.

One of his suggestions is that the advocate should not state or imply that in his proposition he has absolute truth. Russell would wish to cultivate what he calls the "Liberal outlook," and "the essence of the Liberal outlook lies not in *what* opinions are held, but *how* they are held: instead of being held dogmatically, they are held tentatively, and with a consciousness that new evidence may at any moment lead to their abandonment."[50] Thus "although we can never be justified in feeling certainty, some things are more likely to be true than others. Probability should be our guide in practice, since it is reasonable to act on the most probable of possible hypotheses."[51]

Another of Russell's suggestions for the ethical use of language follows from his two classifications of propositions or arguments. If a proposition is scientific, appeals to desire and emotion should not be used to gain its acceptance. For example, if a man wishes to sell pills which are supposed to cure an ailment, he should sell them on the merits of their actual curative capacity and not on the ground that the patient wishes to be cured. But, if a proposition is not amenable to scientific argument, if it is in the area of ethical consideration, appeals to emotion and desire are not only acceptable but necessary. However, in appeals to desire Russell would suggest certain restraints: "The ultimate aim of those who have power (and we all have some) should be to promote social cooperation, not in one group as against another, but in the whole human race."[52] In short, in using appeals to desire, as in all human conduct, "The supreme moral rule should, therefore, be: *Act so as to produce harmonious rather than discordant desires.*"[53] There are, of course, exceptions to this rule.

[49] Russell, *Power: A New Social Analysis*, p. 143.

[50] Russell, *Unpopular Essays*, p. 15.

[51] Russell, *A History of Western Philosophy*, p. 261.

[52] Russell, *Power: A New Social Analysis*, p. 283.

[53] Russell, *An Outline of Philosophy*, p. 242.

just as there are exceptions to every rule of moral and ethical conduct.

A final suggestion that Russell would make for the best kind of language usage involves propaganda and its use. He says, "Propaganda may be defined as any attempt, by means of persuasion, to enlist human beings in the service of one party to any dispute."[54] Russell would admit such advocacy of one side of an issue not only because it would be difficult to eliminate, but because advocacy of only one side of an issue is sometimes desirable. For example, "To demand of a teacher that he shall abstain altogether from expressing controversial opinions is to demand that he shall be dull and shall suppress half of his personality."[55] What he would prefer to see would be a guarantee that both sides of a controversy have an opportunity to be heard.

In sum, Russell offers the following moral or ethical injunctions for the man who wishes to influence the behavior of other men by language: Assert the probable rather than the absolute, appeal to evidence whenever possible, appeal to those desires which promote harmony rather than discord, and insure that all points of view have opportunity for expression.

Conclusion

We may conclude that, in general, a system of rhetoric based upon Russell's philosophical position would have three basic characteristics. First, a heavy emphasis would be placed upon facts as the basis for conclusions and for appeals to support those conclusions. Second, appeals to desire would be sanctioned, but such appeals would be controlled by ethical considerations, namely, that social harmony should be promoted by appeals to desire. Third, much importance would be given to the role of rhetoric as an ethical and moral force in shaping society.

Now that the views of Russell on the presuppositions of rhetoric have been presented, we must ask what importance they have for the rhetorician? Russell has reiterated some old ideas, he has put some old ideas into new perspective, and he has presented some ideas for rhetoric which might be considered new.

Of the old ideas put into new perspective let us examine two. When Russell baldly states that human nature can be changed, his idea may not be new, but such a view might encourage a re-examination of the structure of appeals employed by various rhetorical systems. Rather than rely merely upon appeals to existing desires, rhetoric may well attempt to alter those desires which exist and shape them into socially desirable forms. And the fact that Russell considers language to be a habit no different from, say, brushing your teeth in the morning, may not be a new idea either, but it will, perhaps, take on a new vividness.

Of the new ideas presented there are several. Russell envisages two avenues of appeal, or the converse, two modes of proof which are separable only in theory. This classification would suggest that a genuine difference exists between a system of rhetoric based upon Russell and systems of rhetoric which separate appeals into categories of logical, emotional, and ethical. The hypothesis of two avenues of appeal would suggest, at least, a means of explaining the theoretical difference between conviction and persuasion. More probably, it suggests an abandonment of the dichotomy. Russell's views on rhetoric would further suggest that if it is the indicative and assertive capacity of language which

[54] Bertrand Russell, *Education and the Social Order* (London, 1932), p. 213.
[55] *Ibid.*, p. 225.

influences behavior, the rhetorician might do well to intensify his investigations of the assertive and indicative capacity of language and its relation to behavior. And Russell presents a new idea which is bound up with the nature of assertions or propositions. If, as Russell claims, the nature of the proposition determines the kind of argument that should dominate, ethical criticism might be reoriented. Instead of deciding whether or not appeals to desires, in general, are ethical, the problem would be one of determining whether a preponderance of appeal to desire is ethical for a given proposition or whether fact should be the basic appeal for that particular proposition.

After making a study of Russell's views on rhetoric I have come to the conclusion that not only was Natanson correct in the view that rhetoric could benefit from a re-wedding with philosophy, but that the study of philosophic inquiries presents a sound method for the re-examination of tenets of rhetoric presently held. Russell's views are those of only one man and are necessarily limited in scope. His considerations lie mainly in the areas of invention and, perhaps, style. They shed no light on the problems of disposition, delivery, or memory. If additional investigations were made of prominent philosophers, perhaps a body of hypotheses for rhetoric could be formulated which would be in accord with present knowledge of the nature of language and human behavior. These hypotheses could, in turn, lead to a synthesis with present doctrine to produce a rhetoric with a sound philosophical basis.

* * *

BENITO MUSSOLINI, CROWD PSYCHOLOGIST

Frank Iezzi

IN the annals of recorded history, there are few examples of rulers who relied as much on the art of oratory to achieve and to maintain control of their countries as did Benito Mussolini. Mussolini was the first ruler in history to have at his disposal, and to take full advantage of, the loudspeaker electrically to amplify his voice. As a result, on occasion Mussolini was heard by mass audiences estimated at more than 400,000 people. Perhaps never before had such large audiences been assembled in one place at one time to hear one man speak. It seems gratuitous to suggest that anyone interested in oratory ought to be interested in such a speaker.

Mussolini progressed from the lowly position of street-corner orator, struggling to catch the indifferent ear of passersby, to the elevated position of Premier of Italy addressing hundreds of thousands of wildly cheering Italians in the public squares. Examination of the settings of forty representative political speeches by Mussolini, extending from 1910 to 1945, reveals not only that the size and nature of his audience changed but also that Mussolini developed into a specialist in crowd psychology.

Before turning to a consideration of Mussolini's use of crowd psychology, we should note that Mussolini did not "invent" the techniques he employed to condition his audiences. Actually, a similar formula had been used in religious ceremonies for centuries. Without any disrespect toward the Catholic Church, it might be said that if one compared the crowd waiting in the Piazza Venezia for a speech by Mussolini with that waiting in St. Peter's Square for a speech by the Pope, one would find striking similarities. In a sense, this was one of the several ways in which Mussolini imitated the Catholic Church. Mussolini's "originality" consisted of diverting to political purposes some of the rites and ceremonies to which his audience was already conditioned, of expanding the repertoire of such techniques, and of employing them in a premeditated, systematic manner.

Mussolini was thoroughly confident about his ability to move the masses emotionally, almost at will. For example, in response to the question whether he thought the masses ought to be encouraged to think or merely to believe, he said:

> It is faith that moves mountains, not reason. Reason is a tool but it can never be the motive force of the crowd. Today less than ever. Today people have not so much time to think as they used to have. The capacity of the modern man for faith is illimitable. When the masses are like wax in my hands, when I stir their faith, or when I mingle with them and am almost crushed by them, I feel myself to be a part of them. All the same, there persists in me a certain feeling of aversion, like that which the modeller feels for the clay he is moulding. Does not the sculptor sometimes smash his block of marble into fragments because he cannot shape it to represent the vision he has conceived? . . . Everything turns upon one's ability to control the masses like an artist![1]

Mussolini had no love for the crowd

Mr. Iezzi (Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1954) is Assistant Professor of Speech and Drama at Hofstra College, Hempstead, New York. This article is based on research done for his doctoral dissertation.

[1] Emil Ludwig, *Talks With Mussolini* (Boston, 1933), p. 126.

or respect for it. Megaro wrote: "He derives keen pleasure from playing with the emotions of a crowd; he has compared the crowd to a woman, but he does not respect it."[2] In an interview with Emil Ludwig, Mussolini asserted:

> For me the masses are nothing but a herd of sheep, so long as they are unorganized. I am in nowise antagonistic to them. All that I deny is that they are capable of ruling themselves. But if you would lead them, you must guide them by two reins: enthusiasm and [self-] interest. He who uses only one of these reins is in grave danger. The mystical and the political factors condition each other reciprocally. Either without the other is arid, withered, and is stripped of its leaves by the discomforts of life; that is only for the few. . . . Today I spoke only a few words to those in the Piazza. Tomorrow millions will read them, but those who actually stood there have a livelier faith in what they heard with their ears and, if I may say so, heard with their eyes. Every speech made to the crowd has a two-fold object: to clarify the situation and to suggest something to the masses. That is why speeches made to the people are essential to the arousing of enthusiasm for a war.[3]

Aside from the rhetorical techniques for audience manipulation which Mussolini employed in the texts of his speeches and in the actual delivery of them, his knowledge of crowd psychology was even more markedly demonstrated by his ability to prepare and condition the crowd, long before his arrival on the scene. At the peak of his oratorical career, Mussolini no longer delivered a speech—he "staged" it. His speeches were no longer abrupt pronouncements—they were really theatrical productions.

Three basic ingredients comprised Mussolini's formula for rendering a crowd receptive to his brand of oratory: an atmosphere of suspense, physical and psychological discomfort, and elaborate spectacle.

Creating an atmosphere of suspense and expectancy began long in advance of the actual delivery of the speech. Generally, no official proclamation was made that a speech by the Duce was to be given, but a full twenty-four hours before the speech, rumors were systematically and strategically spread. High-level Fascist dignitaries appeared in full military dress at the local supper clubs and night clubs the night before the speech. During the night a new poster appeared on the many street-corner bulletin boards, hinting at the subject of the speech or at least suggesting which nation the speech would be directed against—for most of the Duce's mass audience speeches were "against" speeches. The next morning the first editions of the daily newspapers echoed in bold headlines the sentiments expressed by the new street-corner poster. Suspense and expectancy were engendered further by the manner in which people were summoned to the square. The morning mail brought a pink card to the average Italian of the city in which the speech was to be delivered, indicating to him that his presence at the speech was expected. The average male, if he was over four years old and under sixty-five, was involved in some sort of military or quasi-military service. He was ordered to report to the assembly place of his particular military headquarters and from there to proceed in formation to the square. Failure to comply with the request might result in fine or imprisonment. The pink card did not specify what time the Duce was to speak. It merely instructed the recipient to arrive at the square at noon. Another signal which summoned Italians to the meeting place was the pealing of church bells. For peasants in outlying areas

[2] Gaudens Megaro, *Mussolini in the Making* (New York, 1938), p. 320.

[3] Ludwig, pp. 120-121.

too remote to hear the church bells, formations of Balilla Boys (Cub Scouts) equipped with drums were dispatched to notify them that their presence was requested. Combined with this air of expectancy was one of festivity. Unless the urgency of events prevented it, Mussolini scheduled his major speeches for Saturdays. Presumably, after an arduous week of work, the average Italian was in the mood for the festivity and diversion afforded by a Mussolini speaking occasion, especially since few other entertainments were available. Another reason Mussolini scheduled these public demonstrations for Saturday instead of a work day was that fewer man-hours of production would be lost through absence of workers from fields and factories.

The second ingredient of Mussolini's formula for conditioning the audience required that the crowd be brought to a state of marked irritability. A premeditated, systematic effort was made to subject the audience to physical and psychological exhaustion. To begin with, the average member of the audience was already tired when he arrived at the square because he had walked several miles to get there. Bus service, rather than being increased for the occasion, was severely curtailed or completely discontinued. The average Italian did not own a car; and if he did, there were probably no gas ration stamps available for such "pleasure" driving. If he had both car and ration stamps, he probably could find no parking place within miles of the square. Physical discomfort was aggravated by the straining of the neck necessary to see the speaking balcony, which was usually located three stories above the heads of the audience. Consequently the square usually filled from the furthermost areas first, to reduce the angle of head-elevation and thereby the strain. People preferred the outskirts and rear fringes of the crowd also because of a justifiable fear of being trampled to death. Another major cause of physical discomfort was the jostling, pushing, and squirming of the hundreds of thousands pressed together in shoulder-to-shoulder, chin-to-back proximity. Furthermore, except for those who had thought to pack box-lunches, everyone was hungry, for the few eating places in the area were closed and shuttered, either by governmental decree or for defense against the pushing throng. Toilet facilities, too, were sorely inadequate to accommodate the hundreds of thousands present. And over all, there was the intense mid-day Italian sun beating down upon the perspiring crowd.

Perhaps the greatest source of physical and psychological discomfort was the strain of waiting. Even though Mussolini ordered the crowd to assemble at noon, he often had no intention of appearing before dusk! It is significant that, according to social psychologists and to the accident figures compiled by automobile insurance companies, the human senses and critical faculties operate least effectively during the twilight period of the day. Actually, there were some occasions when Mussolini was many miles away in another city while hundreds of thousands of people, pressed closely together, were craning their necks to watch the balcony, eagerly expecting the Duce to appear at any moment. On several occasions they had been assembled for seven hours before he appeared.

The third basic ingredient of Mussolini's formula for "warming up" an audience before his arrival was the lavish use of spectacle. One of the basic tenets of his theory of crowd psychology was that elaborate spectacle, both visual and auditory, plays an important part in

stirring the masses. Thus, when he was asked how his particular revolution compared with those of earlier days, he responded:

> Every revolution creates new forms, new myths, and new rites; and the would-be revolutionist, while using old traditions, must refashion them. He must create new festivals, new gestures, new forms, which will themselves become traditional. The airplane festival is new today. In half-a-century, it will be encrusted with the patina of tradition.[4]

The Duce continually drew parallels between his empire and the ancient Roman Empire; he insisted that much of the spectacle be based on traditional Roman forms. The following is an excerpt from an interview between Mussolini and Emil Ludwig:

> *Ludwig*: What part does music play in influencing the masses? What part do women play, and gestures and emblems?
> *Mussolini*: They are all spectacular elements. Music and women allure the crowd and make it more pliable. The Roman greeting, songs, and formulas, anniversary commemorations, and the like—all are essential to fan the flames of the enthusiasm that keeps a movement in being. It was just the same in ancient Rome.[5]

Some of Mussolini's biographers suggest that in addition to recognizing the value of spectacle in any crowd situation, he was shrewd enough to see that this social-psychological phenomenon might be particularly effective because he was dealing with Italian crowds.

> Fully alive to the value of stage trappings and always ready to gratify the Latin love of display, on occasions of ceremony he delights the populace by appearing in the cocked-hat and bullion encrusted court dress to which his position as Prime Minister entitles him. . . . He is a born showman. In his sense of the dramatic, his ability to hold the center of the stage, his genius for entertaining the masses, he has been equalled in modern times only by two men, Theodore Roosevelt and Phineas T. Barnum.[6]

In "staging" a speech to a mass audience, Mussolini saw to it that the audience would be barraged by auditory stimuli. In addition to the tumult of hundreds of thousands of Italians whistling, cheering, and applauding, there was the din of half-a-dozen blaring military brass bands, the metallic clatter of mechanized tank and artillery units passing in review, the deafening roar of bomber planes flying in close formation directly overhead, and the resounding thud of cannon breaking out repeatedly in twenty-one gun salutes. The Duce also provided a stunning barrage of visual stimuli. All the military units appeared resplendent in their ornate, gold-encrusted, full-dress uniforms; the brightly colored Italian Tri-Color was conspicuously displayed; gaudily colored regional banners and gold-plated, flag-bedecked labari (standards) of the various Fascist divisions were omnipresent; and, on occasion, vividly colored, ornately brocaded bunting framed and decorated the balcony on which Mussolini was to appear.

Perhaps the most vivid illustration of the Duce's use of dramatic spectacle was the extravagantly theatrical manner in which his actual entrance was staged. Mussolini almost invariably spoke from a balcony. Most Italian cities and even many small villages have a town square with an overhanging balcony from which public pronouncements can be made. Mussolini recognized that a theatrical entrance upon such a balcony contributed much to the spectacle he sought to create, and when no balcony was available for his purpose, he was likely to order that one be built. Undoubtedly the balconies served the ordinary function of making the speaker more easily visible, and perhaps, Mussolini may have considered that the height of a balcony would discourage snipers

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 121.
[6] E. Alexander Powell, *Embattled Borders* (New York, 1928), p. 68.

or bomb-throwers. But the Duce's balconies were above all stages on which the climactic scenes of his dramatic productions were played. As soon as twilight had fallen, giant kleiglights were focused on the balcony. Torches began to appear on the fringes of the crowd. Bonfires were lit on the rooftops of nearby buildings. An eerie, Hallowe'en-like atmosphere was thus created. The first real indication that the Duce was about to appear was the slow opening of the huge French windows which led onto the balcony and the appearance of two extremely tall, impressively uniformed Musketeer guards. They took their positions at either side of the balcony, at "parade rest." Next, amid tumultuous applause, the heavily bemedalled, ostentatiously uniformed top-level Fascist entourage came into view. After they had been "established" in the view of the audience, they smartly assumed a three-quarters-closed body position, facing the open French windows in obvious anticipation. Next, a shrill fanfare from the trumpet section announced the arrival of the Secretary of the Fascist Party, the second highest Fascist official. The secretary moved briskly to the front of the balcony and, shrieking at the top of his voice, ordered, "Fascisti! Salute il Duce!", and led the throng in the official Fascist cheer: "Ejah! Ejah! Ejah! Alalah!" It was toward the attainment of this fever pitch of excitement and tension that all the efforts of the previous twenty-four hours had been directed. At last, Mussolini stepped smilingly into view and graciously accepted the generous ovation accorded him.

What social-psychological principles of crowd psychology was Mussolini exploiting by exposing his audience to so many hours of physical and psychological strain? We may detect the operation of two such broad principles:

1. Theories of crowd psychology differ but most leading theorists agree that individuals tend to become less critical of their own responses when they find those responses are shared by other members of a crowd. Mussolini recognized that principle and, in addition, he knew that when an individual is reduced to a state of physical and psychological exhaustion, his ability to think rationally is further dulled. Thus, Mussolini premeditatedly sought to wear down his audience in order to render it more suggestible to emotional appeal and less wary of shoddy logic.

2. When a member of a crowd is subjected to physical and psychological strain, he experiences a marked feeling of irritability. It was Mussolini's intent to reduce the listener to a state of diffuse, generalized irritability *before* he spoke so that *when* he spoke he could channel this feeling of resentment and focus it against some concrete opponent. The diffuse resentment welling up inside the listener was therefore ready-made for the speaker before his arrival, saving him the effort of stirring up such feeling during the speech.

THE BRITISH ORATORS, VII
JOHN MORLEY'S SPEECHMAKING

Hermann G. Stelzner

JOHN MORLEY (1838-1923) was a well-known English man of letters and critic of public address. His biographies of Cobden and Gladstone, for instance, are noteworthy for their emphasis on the spoken word and the part it played in the lives of these statesmen. H. A. Wichelns found in these biographies rhetorical analysis based on a synthesis of the factors of time, place, and personalities.[1] Thonssen and Baird refer to Morley as a "critic and . . . philosopher of oratory,"[2] and more recently Dwain E. Moore has investigated those aspects of public address which most interested Morley and has commented upon his critical methodology.[3]

Today, Morley's reputation as a *littérateur* overshadows his achievements as a politician and speaker. Nevertheless, his service as a spokesman for the Liberal Party in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is an interesting part of English political and social history. Morley sat in the House of Commons for twenty-five years, representing Newcastle from 1883 to 1895,[4] and the Montrose-Burghs, Scotland, from 1896 to 1908. In the latter year he became Viscount Morley of Blackburn and ascended to the House of Lords where he remained until the outbreak of hostilities in Europe in 1914 brought his retirement from public life.[5]

The major part of Morley's career as a speaker lies between 1883 and 1896, when he was most active and most influential in politics. During this time he presented and defended his Party's policies throughout England as well as in Parliament. For instance, in 1885 he made speeches at "every point of the geographic compass."[6] In another period of eighteen months he delivered over a hundred political addresses to his constituents in Newcastle.[7] And by 1888, according to Francis Hirst, Morley was, next to Gladstone and perhaps Harcourt, the most popular Liberal orator in England.[8] In view of the many years Morley spent in public life, it seems strange that his speeches have remained buried in *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates* and *The Times*, and that his name is rarely mentioned as a speaker of some

Mr. Stelzner (Ph.D., Illinois, 1957) is Instructor in Speech at Queens College, Flushing, N. Y.

[1] Herbert A. Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," in *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans* (New York, 1925), pp. 181-216; reprinted in *The Rhetorical Idiom*, ed. Donald C. Bryant (Ithaca, N. Y., 1958), pp. 5-42.

[2] Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, *Speech Criticism* (New York, 1948), p. 268.

[3] Dwain E. Moore, "John Morley: Critic of Public Address," *QJS*, XLIV (April 1958), 161-165.

[4] The biography of Cobden, first published in 1881, had a direct effect on his election. A cheap edition sold over thirty thousand copies in the two years prior to his candidacy and made his name known to Liberals and Radicals throughout northern England.

[5] See his *Memorandum on Resignation* (London, 1928).

[6] John Morley, *Recollections*, in *The Works of Lord Morley in Fifteen Volumes* (London, 1921), I, 182.

[7] *The Times* (London), February 10, 1887. Hereinafter cited as *Times*.

[8] Francis W. Hirst, "John Morley," *DNB, 1922-1930*. Hirst's work, *Early Life and Letters of John Morley* (London, 1927), is especially valuable for details of Morley's life to 1883. Hirst assisted Morley with research for the Gladstone biography, and the two men became intimate friends. Morley's wife and sister are the sources of much information which Hirst relates.

prominence and ability in the books and journals on the history and criticism of public address. This paper proposes to examine the major sources of Morley's influence and appeal as a speaker by (1) reviewing briefly the major causes which he supported, (2) describing his character as it appeared to those who knew him and heard him, and 3) evaluating the presentation of his ideas to his audiences.

1.

The ideas and principles which Morley supported on the platform were first formulated and presented to the public by Morley the journalist and essayist. He used books, newspapers, and journals as pulpits from which to preach his radical, liberal ideas concerning politics, ethics, education, and religion.[9] In his books and articles one finds that "a golden thread of consistent idealism runs unbroken, on a foundation of unshaken faith in democracy, liberty, and human progress."[10] J. A. Spender, a close literary acquaintance, states that "young men swore by him and found in his writings a more fervent and brilliant exposition of Liberal ideas than anywhere else except in the speeches of Mr. Gladstone."[11] A passage in Morley's *Recollections* defines the humanistic premises on which his Liberalism was built:

> Respect for the dignity and worth of the individual is its root. It stands for pursuit of social good against class interest or dynastic interest. It stands for the subjection to human judgment of all claims of external authority, whether in an organised Church, or in more loosely gathered societies of believers, or in books held sacred. In law-making it does not neglect the higher characteristics of human nature, it attends to them first. In executive administration, though judge, gaoler, and perhaps the hangman will be indispensable, still mercy is counted a wise supplement to terror.[12]

Morley's articles and editorials made his views and interest in political affairs well known before he committed himself to a parliamentary career. His transition from an observer of the political arena to an active participant in it was slow. He hesitated because he questioned whether a man with a reputation for being "a chartered preacher against Men-pleasers" could hope to wield any influence in a deliberative body, and he wrote that it seemed "absurd for one who had begun on the literary side of his life by repudiating conventions, to launch into political action which has for its very first working principle compliance with conventions."[13]

In spite of his feelings about the necessities of political life, Morley's refusal to compromise his liberal ideals is evidenced by his consistent support of social and political reforms. The three decades following his election can be divided into three chapters. In the first and most important, 1883-1895, he was principally concerned with the struggle for Irish self-government. The second chapter spans the years 1896 to 1905, when he extolled the cause of international justice and denounced capitalistic imperialism. In the third chapter, 1905-1914, he was relatively inactive and

[9] The influences on Morley's thought have been traced by Warren Staebler, *The Liberal Mind of John Morley* (Princeton, N. J., 1943), and Frances W. Knickerbocker, *Free Minds: John Morley and His Friends* (Cambridge, Mass., 1943). Also see Morley, *Recollections*, I, 3-115.

[10] Hirst, *Early Life*, II, 133.

[11] J. A. Spender, "Lord Morley, Last of the Victorian Liberals," *Living Age*, CCCXIX (November 1923), 207.

[12] Morley, *Recollections*, I, 19.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 172. His sister once asked him if he had considered standing for Parliament and he replied in a letter to her that he saw no reason for doing so because, "If I want to say anything, I can say it with quite as much certainty of being listened to as if I were in Parliament." In another letter dated March 27, 1872, he wrote his friend Frederic Harrison, "The pen is my instrument, rather than the tongue." Hirst, *Early Life*, II, 75; I, 213. Staebler, *Liberal Mind*, p. 193, indicates that Morley decided to enter politics as early as 1863.

spoke infrequently in Parliament and the country. He served as Secretary for India, 1905-1910, and administered that colony according to the principles he had advocated for Ireland. Under his leadership reforms were initiated which gave the Indians some voice in the government of their country.[14] From 1912 until his retirement in 1914 he was senior member of the British Cabinet and served as its Lord President.

These constitute the major chapters of Morley's parliamentary career, but there are other less important ones. Always interested in social measures, he continually raised his voice in defense of labor and trade unionism. He also advocated strenuously the adoption of programs of national health insurance, the extension of the franchise, the cause of free trade, and, above all, a program of free national education.

Morley's concern for the freedom and well-being of the mass of men can be seen in his support of the Irish demands for self-government. Before 1885 he advocated a policy of conciliation toward Ireland, because he believed that England had governed her in the interests of the English landed gentry and had totally neglected the economic and social needs of the Irish people. However, elections in Ireland in 1885[15] convinced him that conciliation without some measure of autonomy for Ireland was a fruitless dream. In December 1885 he announced publicly that he would support Irish demands for Home Rule "subject to the limits that are imposed upon it by the safety, the integrity, and the honour of the sovereign realm as a whole."[16] Morley was the first major Liberal to make such a pronouncement, and his support of the Irish demands was partially responsible for a major split in the Liberal Party in 1886.[17] In his speeches he maintained that the Irish, as a people, were inherently entitled to their own legislature, that England's neglect of social and economic conditions in Ireland was the cause of the Irish rebellions against English governments, and that England would never be free to attend to her own political, social, and economic problems so long as the Irish members in Commons disrupted the work of that House by astute parliamentary maneuvering.[18]

Morley worked zealously on behalf of the cause. More than any other Englishman he sought the friendship of the Irish leaders in the House. He often went to Ireland to view conditions and to observe the manner in which English administrators implemented policies.[19] His deep and broad knowledge of Irish conditions resulted in his selection by Gladstone for the post of Secretary for Ireland in two Liberal Cabinets. As Sec-

[14] See his *Indian Speeches, 1907-1909* (London, 1909).

[15] The Irish electorate sent eighty-five members to Parliament, all of whom were pledged by Parnell, the leader of the Home Rulers, to agitate for independence. By controlling such a large group, Parnell could determine the balance of power in Commons, and he always threw his weight in with the side which promised him the most.

[16] *Times*, December 22, 1885.

[17] Joseph Chamberlain, a personal friend of Morley's, led a large group of Liberals out of the party in 1886. The group, called Liberal-Unionists, often voted with the Conservatives on Irish matters.

[18] For an admirable summary of Morley's efforts on behalf of Ireland see W. J. Johnstone, "Mr. Morley and Ireland," *Westminister Review*, CLXC (May 1906), 475-492; also see Morley's, "The Government of Ireland: A Reply," *The Nineteenth Century*, XXI (January 1887), 19-39; (February 1887), 301-320.

[19] The Conservatives controlled the Government from July 1886 to August 1892, and much of Morley's criticism of English policy was directed at that Government. He was especially critical of the Coercion Act of 1887, which placed Ireland, for all practical purposes, under martial law. Three of the longest speeches he delivered in the House dealt with that Act and its administration. See *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, 3d ser., CCCXXVII (June 25, 1888); 3d ser., CCCXXXIII (February 23, 1889); 3d ser., CCL (February 16, 1891).

retary he guided the formulation of the two Home Rule Bills which the Liberals presented to the House. Gladstone wrote of him during the bitter controversy, "He is on the whole . . . about the best stay I have."[20] A *Times* editorial which stated that no man did more "than MR. MORLEY to commit his party to Home Rule" reflects his influence.[21]

Although his counsels regarding self-government for Ireland were rejected, Morley lived to see the Irish Free State established. Upon the creation of that State in 1921, he was invited, in recognition of his long years of support of Home Rule, to move the King's Address in Parliament. In a short speech he alluded to the past controversies between England and Ireland and asked his auditors to accept the proposal to create an independent Irish State as the only just course of action:

> It has been said that this [creation of Irish Free State] is "abject humiliation"—those two words have been used. . . . I cannot see any trace of humiliation in it. The good wishes of the entire world, almost an unparalleled phenomenon, go out to us in this movement. Let me ask a question. The alternative, the opposite, to humiliation is pride. I wonder whether anybody, any Englishman, any citizen of Great Britain, can look back upon the Government of Ireland by Great Britain as an object of pride. Surely, so far from being that, the misrule of Ireland by our country has been a catchword for an age or more. I will put it this way. A great nation ought to have a good conscience. I submit that as a proposition. I then ask: Can anybody defend the proposition that the Government of Ireland all these years has been such as the conscience, the political conscience, can approve? I think not.[22]

Morley's criticism of British imperialism was based on the same principle which governed his stand on the Irish question. He felt that the colonists were exploited by the mother country. In 1883 he stated his basic position toward colonization. His "maxim would be that of a great man [Cobden] whom I have done something to make known to the public—I am in favour of not meddling in the affairs of other people." But if England were by some chance brought into contact with people on her frontiers, "I would imperatively require that our agents and representatives should practise towards them the same fairness, the same honesty, and the same vigorous good faith which we exact from others toward us."[23] Standing on that principle of foreign policy, he questioned the right of various European nations to extend their power forcibly over frontiers not rightfully theirs. He severely criticized England's intervention in Egypt, the Sudan, Turkey, Greece, and The Transvaal. He fought those jingoes in his party and the Conservative Party who were leading England into the Boer War. He warned that the race among the European powers for new territory coupled with the build-up of armaments among those powers would ultimately end in conflict. Out of step with the prevailing political temper of the time, he was characterized as a "Little Englander," who played a considerable part as the advocate of "our friend the enemy."

The "root" of Morley's philosophy was his belief in the "dignity and worth of the individual." This faith is echoed throughout his speeches, in his defense of the Irish, in his defense of British Colonials, and in his defense of reform measures for the English people.

2.

As a result of the positions he took on leading issues of the day, Morley was admired as a supporter of democratic, liberal principles. He earned respect not

[20] John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (London, 1903), III, 499, footnote.
[21] *Times*, July 19, 1895.
[22] *Hansard*, 5th ser., XLVIII (December 14, 1921).
[23] Hirst, *Early Life*, II, 161.

only for his ideas but also for his fairness and moderation as a proponent. This philosopher-scholar-turned-statesman was a unique figure in the setting of party politics. By nature somewhat introverted and shy, by training accustomed to think for himself in his study or editorial office, by preference disposed toward philosophical rather than practical matters, he gained esteem for his cultivated mind, his urbane, modest manner, his independent thought, his consistent actions, and the just, candid pronouncements of his views.

That he won the respect of his parliamentary colleagues cannot be denied. Morley held strong convictions, but he listened with politeness and respect to what he thought hopeless nonsense. His ideas were stated in a reserved, temperate manner which was quite different from the "down-thump style of conversation indulged in by some roysterers of politics."[24] Always a keen opponent, whether in public or private, he was a "punctilious fighter"[25] whose speeches, remarked Lord Salisbury, "did not provoke animosity."[26] Another Conservative once said of him, "If all Radicals were like Morley we could at least discuss things, and to discuss them would be a pleasure."[27] The parliamentary reporter, Henry Lucy, relates that few men of his "uncompromising political principles" had so many "well-wishers and sincere admirers on the Conservative benches."[28]

Although respected by his colleagues, Morley could hardly be termed popular with them. In the House he stood aloof from the rank-and-file. A Liberal who sat with him for nearly a quarter of a century related that they never exchanged a word.[29] A lampoonist captured the essence of his character when he captioned a sketch of Morley seated in the House, "Johnny-Head-in-Air."[30] Trained to probe and study ideas to their very roots, and long accustomed to conflicts with ideas rather than men, he was devoid of the special readiness and alertness of mind required for effective parliamentary action. Moreover, his reputation as a doctrinaire who pushed his principles to their limits mitigated against his being a party whip. Concerned as he was with his own integrity, he had difficulty thinking in terms of "we," and some of his colleagues resented the impression he gave of being "Mr. Valiant for Truth" and his tendency to lecture rather than address the House. A. G. Gardiner concluded that he was "never . . . quite happy in public life" for he had little "zest for the rough-and-tumble of the political game" with "its acerbities, expediences, and compromises."[31]

Semi-seclusion from party warfare, however, had its advantages. He could say what he thought, and his speechmaking exemplifies forthright, candid pronouncements made without concern

[24] W. T. Stead, "The Right Hon. John Morley, M. P.," *Review of Reviews*, II (November 1890), 429.

[25] Rt. Hon. George Hamilton, *Parliamentary Reminiscences and Reflections, 1886-1906* (London, 1922), I, 39.

[26] Morley, *Recollections*, I, 227.

[27] George W. Smalley, *London Letters* (London, 1891), I, 235.

[28] Henry Lucy, *A Diary of Two Parliaments, 1880-1885* (London, 1886), p. 379. Also see Thomas Bowran, "John Morley," *Westminister Review*, CLIV (August 1900), 19; "Study in Character: The Right Honourable John Morley," *The New Review*, VIII (April 1893), 438; Winston Churchill, *Great Contemporaries* (New York, 1937), p. 79.

[29] Alexander Mackintosh, *Echoes of Big Ben: A Journalist's Parliamentary Diary, 1881-1940* (London, 1946), p. 54.

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] A. G. Gardiner, "Honest John," *The Nation and the Athenaeum*, XXXIII (September 1923), 799. See the open letter to Morley which appeared in *Fair Game* and which stated that there was "too much of the philosopher about you, too much of the student, for the rough and tumble game of politics." Harry Furniss, *Some Victorian Men* (London, 1924), p. 5.

for personal welfare or party fortunes. His courage in standing on his principles is evidenced by his altruistic support of the Irish, a stand which he described as necessary to his "mental peace."[32] The way he stated the problem won the admiration of *The Times*, which was unalterably opposed to Home Rule. *The Times* conceded that he was one of the very few who were "not converted [to Home Rule] with ludicrous haste in very suspicious circumstances," and it admitted that his views were stated with "the utmost clearness and frankness." It speculated that his disregard for personal and party fortunes was "disappointing to the hardened wirepuller, who is probably inclined to swear, in private, at 'that confounded intellect.'" The paper informed its readers that Morley was not a "politician pure and simple," but a statesman who had a "scrupulously high standard of political ethics."[33]

A labor question in the late eighties and early nineties provided another test of statesmanship conducted on *a priori* principles. The laboring class had long agitated for legislation to limit the work day to eight hours, and the majority of Morley's Newcastle constituents were affected by the Eight Hours Bill. Although he generally supported labor, he felt he could not support this measure. No government, he affirmed, had a right to tell a man how long he might work. Aware that the voters would be alienated by his position, he stated that he would rather give up the honor of representing Newcastle than "give way on this point."[34] In 1895 the voters did reject him at the polls. His personal esteem, however, was unblemished in the eyes of his constituents, who "accustomed to an attitude of mobility common to politicians on both sides . . . found refreshment in this spectacle of Mr. Morley with his back to the wall, immovable in an attitude taken upon the question."[35]

The eve of the Boer War in 1899 again found Morley with his back to the wall. He knowingly courted unpopularity with the wish not merely of vindicating his own principles, but of giving a more pacific turn to British foreign policy. At a party meeting in Manchester, attended by the jingoes for the purpose of hooting him down, he refused to compromise his belief that his party was sacrificing its principles by supporting the agitation for war. He told the gathering:

> You may carry fire and sword into the midst of peace and industry: it will be wrong. A war of the strongest government in the world with untold wealth and inexhaustible reserves against this little republic will bring you no glory: it will be wrong. You may make thousands of women widows and thousands of children fatherless: it will be wrong. It may add a new province to your empire: it will still be wrong. You may give buoyancy to the African stock and share market: it will still be wrong.[36]

Unlike some of his colleagues, Morley could be depended upon to fulfill his policy statements. And the Irish, accustomed to vacillations by English politicians, "came to trust him more than . . . any other English statesman."[37] A Liberal colleague, Viscount Esher, wrote him that he was the "only 'Leader'" whose motives lay "outside the sphere of suspicion and con-

[32] Morley, *Recollections*, I, 186. Letter to Joseph Chamberlain, December 24, 1885.

[33] The statements above are taken from the following issues of *The Times*: April 21, 1888, February 3, 1886, November 7, 1896, July 19, 1895, and July 9, 1895.

[34] *Times*, April 25, 1889.

[35] Henry Lucy, *A Diary of the Home Rule Parliament, 1892-1895* (London, 1896), p. 320.

[36] *Times*, September 16, 1899.

[37] *The Spectator*, LXVII (August 22, 1891), 246.

jecture."[38] In a letter to another party member Esher wrote that Morley was the only Liberal who had any conception of the place of morality in politics: "[He] . . . represents to me the moral element of our party. No one else has the conception of it; and he will bear onward that torch when it falls from Mr. G's hand. All these things are not to be written about, but pondered over."[39]

To the general public Morley was something of a stoic hero. He was popular at party gatherings, and his public indicated its respect for him by use of the epithet, "Honest John."[40] The epithet was not a nick-name, but a homely and apt characterization. *The Spectator,* a Conservative paper, analysed the reasons for his popularity with the people by comparing and contrasting him with other Liberal speakers; it concluded that he was popular because he could be believed in as a man:

> The preference of the people shows that they have an eye to that keenness and reality of purpose which, except in their aged chief [Gladstone], is not to be found in much force elsewhere among the leaders of the Opposition, and that they value a certain clean cut sincerity of aim more than they value popular jokes like Sir William Harcourt's or even satire like Lord Rosebery's. The people like evidence of a certain grimness of purpose in their leaders. They do not trust statesmen who intimate, either indirectly or directly, that if their opinions do not please their constituents or their party, "those opinions can be changed," and therefore they do not reverence Sir William Harcourt. They do not trust statesmen who vary their tone, without apparent motive, from one of extreme moderation to one of extreme partisanship; and therefore they do not trust Lord Rosebery. They do not trust statesmen who cling to the party with so much passion that they are almost physically unable to resist the claim of the party to their allegiance; and therefore they do not trust Sir George Trevelyan. But in Mr. Morley they see the earliest and most consistent of the Liberal advocates of Home Rule for Ireland; and moreover, a man independent enough and resolute enough to thwart his own constituents if needs be. . . . There is an element of passion in Mr. Morley, as there is in Mr. Gladstone, no less than an element of inflexibility once his line is taken; and the people love to see signs of purpose which *possesses* their leaders, rather than of one which their leaders can relax and make more strenuous at will. . . . Right or wrong—and no doubt he is wrong—there is a certain grit in Mr. Morley of which none of the other associates of Mr. Gladstone has shown much sympathy. There is a political austerity about him—
>
> "As though the man had fixed his face,
> "In many a solitary place,
> "Against the open wind and open sky."
>
> And when such austerity is associated, as it is in Mr. Morley, with a certain elevation of tone, it has charm for the people at large, which neither an easy-going statesman nor a popularity-seeking statesman can ever exert.[41]

3.

The quarter of a century spent in literary pursuits left Morley ill-prepared to present his ideas before an audience. His lack of platform experience probably explains why listeners frequently commented that he was better to read than to hear, remarking the contrast between his literary style and his rather awkward delivery.

Descriptions of his physical appearance suggest that he was not a very imposing figure; he fitted the stereotype of a man of the closet rather than a man of action. He is pictured as "slight, with the stoop of a scholar," with "eyes at

[38] *Journals and Letters of Reginald Viscount Esher,* ed. Maurice Breet (London, 1934), I, 153.

[39] *Ibid.,* p. 154.

[40] For a description of the meeting at which the epithet was applied to Morley see Edward T. Raymond, *Portraits of the Nineties* (London, 1921), p. 166. Staebler, *Liberal Mind,* p. 119, reports Morley "wincingly disliked" the epithet. He disliked it, Morgan believes, because it equated public with private morality. J. H. Morgan, "The Personality of Lord Morley," *The Quarterly Review,* CCXLI (January 1924), 181.

[41] *The Spectator,* LXVIII (June 1892), 833.

once keen and weary, like all eyes that are the overworked instruments of an active brain depending chiefly on printed matter for its impression."[42] His face revealed a good deal of "shy reserve, of pride and dignity," which suggested "something in him of aloofness and loftiness."[43] Everything about him gave the impression of "completeness" rather than "mass or power."[44]

Morley's voice and gestures were not positive attributes. His voice was neither clear nor melodious; it had a husky, raspy quality. He acknowledges that he had a poor voice; it was decidedly not the equal of Sheridan's or Burke's.[45] His articulation and pronunciation were indistinct; he swallowed and groped for words. His gestures were ragged. He flailed his arms from side to side and shuffled his notes from hand to hand. In short, there was "no distinction of manner" and the delivery was "clogged with difficulties of expression."[46]

As might be expected he was not outstanding in debate. It was a skill which he never completely mastered. His academic stiffness, self-consciousness, insensitiveness to the common mind, and a certain literary fastidiousness prevented him from adapting to fluid give-and-take situations. Two other circumstances help to explain his deficiencies in this area. First, he entered the House at the relatively advanced age of forty-five and thus did not have the long apprenticeship necessary for developing the art. Second, he felt that debate was an inadequate instrument for the solution of social and political problems:

> Much of parliamentary debate is dispute between men who in truth and at bottom agree, but invent arguments to disguise agreement and contrive a difference. It is artificial, but serves a purpose in justifying two lobbies and a party division. You have patiently to learn the wholesome lesson, that wisdom may be wisdom even when she chooses rhetorical apparel. You cannot expect to escape a continual exhibition of the common error of politics, and of much besides, the attribution to one cause of what is the effect of many; nor the vexation of listening to the wrong arguments for the right object. Above all, one often felt the pregnant truth, that most mistakes in politics arise from flat and invincible disregard of the plain maxim that it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be.[47]

Regarded as the chief of England's literary statesmen, Morley showed himself to best advantage when he delivered a platform address. He excelled in expounding his theme in a broad and general way: statement, not reply, was his forte. He elevated party controversy and raised his subject and his auditors above the fumes of everyday politics. He presented his principles in concise but

[42] Raymond, *Portraits of the Nineties*, p. 164.

[43] "John Morley: A Study," by a Member of Parliament, *The Century Illustrated Magazine*, XXXVI n.s. (October 1899), 876.

[44] Raymond, *Portraits of the Nineties*, p. 165.

[45] Morley, *Recollections*, II, 107, 182.

[46] Isaac N. Ford, "John Morley in Politics," *Outlook*, XC (September 1908), 212. Morley's maiden speech in Commons was regarded as a failure. For descriptions see Lucy, *Diary of Parliament, 1892-1895*, p. 36; Furniss, *Some Victorian Men*, pp. 3-4; Sir Henry Lucy, "Lord Morley's Memories," *The Living Age*, CCXCVI (March 1918), 652-653. For other comments about his delivery see *A Victorian Diarist: Extracts from the Journals of Mary, Lady Monkswell*, ed. E. C. F. Collier (London, 1946), p. 3; "Morley, The Man of Letters," *The Literary Digest*, LXXIX (October 27, 1923), 31; "John Morley," *The New Statesman*, XXI (September 29, 1923), 702; J. P. Lilley, "Lord Morley and the Montrose Burghs," *The Fortnightly Review*, CXX (November 1923), 716; J. O. Baylen and P. G. Hogan, "W. T. Stead on the Art of Public Speaking," *QJS*, XLIII (April 1957), 132.

[47] Morley, *Recollections*, I, 175. When a student at Oxford, Morley participated in debates at the Union, but not with any conspicuous success, according to fellow classmates. Hirst, *Early Life*, I, 22. Reports of his debates as a student also appear in Charles E. Mallet, *A History of the University of Oxford* (London, 1927), III, 374, and Herbert A. Morrah, *The Oxford Union, 1823-1923* (London, 1923), pp. 154, 168. Morrah also states that Morley and Randolph Churchill initiated in 1888 the practice of statesmen appearing before the Union to debate a political subject. The debate is reported in *The Times*, March 1, 1888.

sonorous language. The style is the revelation of the man. It shows how much scorn, indignation, pity, and sympathy there was underneath his reserved manner.

Unfortunately his works do not contain a systematic explanation of his principles of speech composition. He explains that in writing he sought, above all, correctness:

> As to literary form, I took too little thought, only trying to follow Aristotle's dictum that the essence of style is to be correct, and clear without being mean or meagre. . . . In the verbal curiosity contemned by Milton as toilsome vanity I had little interest. I was inclined respectfully to go with Montaigne, who laughed at fools who will go a quarter of a league to run after a fine word. Yet here, as in other things, it is well not to hurry to be over-positive. Hazlitt is not wrong when he says there is "a great deal more of research in choice of a plain than of an ornamental or learned style. There may be ten synonyms, yet only one that exactly answers to the idea we have in our minds." Whether the hunt be for a plain word or a fine one, it is less material than the excision of superfluous words, of connecting particles, introductory phrases, and the like things, that seem more trivial for a reader's comfort than they are. In a larger sense than this, how sagacious was Schiller's saying that "an artist may be known rather by what he *omits*." A wholesome secret even for men of letters with pretensions to be artists.[48]

A quotation from one of his speeches indirectly reveals the time and care expended on the composition of major platform addresses. To an audience of miners he stated that "ideas and right expressions are often as difficult to get at and to deal with as coal and ironstone; and the scholar, as he shuts up his books and puts out his lamp, many a time knows a weariness of body and a heaviness of spirit which equals anything known to you as you trudge home of a night from the pit mouth."[49] When he first began speaking in public he apparently felt that his experience in literary composition was of little help in speech writing. After one address he wrote, "I will never lecture again. . . . It is not my line. The literary style and the lecturer's style are as different as scene-painting from miniature."[50]

One quality of style which contributed to his success was his choice and use of language. Churchill comments that the "pageantry as well as the distinction of words"[51] arrested attention, and Murray notes his "exact and completely unaffected"[52] style. When Morley used abstract terminology it was usually followed by a series of explanatory phrases, which left little doubt of his meaning and the extent to which he committed himself. Because he disliked "using violent and strong language" he tempered critical remarks. He preferred the phrase "greatly mistaken" to "absolutely false" when addressing himself to colleagues' proposals.[53] Qualifying phrases such as, "I don't wish to say this, but . . . ," "If I may be pardoned for . . . ," "I am afraid I must say it . . . ," are used consistently to introduce strong statements and critical observations. The qualifications confine his criticism to a narrow area, protect him from generalization, and reveal him as one who was sensitive to the impact that untempered language might have. Morley insisted on precision in language usage because the "qualifications are consistently the most significant part of speeches."[54]

Morley ordered his words as carefully as he chose them. By introducing a word or a phrase with a qualifying statement he directed the listeners' at-

[48] *Ibid.*, pp. 85-86.
[49] Hirst, *Early Life*, II, 23.
[50] *Ibid.*, I, 248.
[51] Churchill, *Great Contemporaries*, p. 79.
[52] Gilbert Murray, "John Morley," *The Nation and the Athenaeum*, XXXIV (January 12, 1924), 542.
[53] Hansard, 3d ser., CCCXXXIII (February 25, 1889).
[54] Morley, *Recollections*, II, 171.

tention to the idea he wanted to emphasize. Two passages, selected arbitrarily, illustrate the effectiveness of his sentence construction:

> It is lamentable . . . to think how the one great single industry [agriculture] of Ireland has been, if I may be pardoned for using the term, bedevilled, by the levity and shortsightedness of Parliament after Parliament.
> These pledges [made by Conservatives]—and I am not using language which I am not prepared to stand by—these pledges have been betrayed.[55]

In these two quotations the key words are "bedevilled" and "betrayed." The importance of the word order to Morley's purpose can be illustrated by rearranging the components of the second statement to make it read: These pledges have been betrayed, and I am not using language which I am not prepared to stand by. In this compound sentence the emphasis is dissipated by the conjunction, "and"; thus it lacks the directive influence and force of Morley's statement.

Morley's speeches are also marked by vigorous and apt descriptions; his aphorisms and epigrams quickly earned him a "reputation for happy phrases."[56] After the Lords rejected Gladstone's Reform Bill in 1884, Morley commented that the only solution was "to mend them, or end them," a phrase which became a rallying cry for those who endorsed reform. Exclamatory statements abound in his addresses. They not only supplied additional force and energy, but they indicated his strong feelings about policies and actions. He ended one discussion of Conservative policy with, "Oh, strange logic! Oh, wondrous policy! Oh, most mysterious and inscrutable statesmanship!"

The intensity with which Morley approached political discussions is reflected in still another way. There is a noticeable absence of humor in his speeches; serious matters are generally treated in a solemn manner. He does not often give a light touch to important problems. And when he does, he is not always successful. On one occasion a reporter thought his levity so inappropriate and so ineptly applied that he cautioned Morley to leave humor to those who could handle it:

> There is something in MR. MORLEY'S jocularity that reminds one of DR. JOHNSON'S celebrated remarks on the merriment of parsons. MR. MORLEY had better leave this department . . . to MR. LABOUCHERE and SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT—they do it not only the "more natural" but with "the better grace" as well.[57]

Morley's intense and sincere expression of his ideas accounts in part for the general evaluations of his speeches as "platform eloquence"[58] and "thrilling oratory."[59] But equally important to his eloquence was his choice of supporting materials. Morley chose materials which directed his listeners to evaluate principles, proposals, and actions in terms of universal needs and behavior. For example, one of his favorite illustrations which he used to demonstrate that all men have the same sentiments and should be judged and treated accordingly was a citation from Shakespeare. The idea was developed with an ethical commonplace concerning man's brotherhood:

> Shakespeare made one of his characters ask: "Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions?" And has not an Irishman affections and passions? Our policy in resisting coercion is to

[55] The first illustration is from *Hansard*, 4th ser., CXVIII (February 23, 1903); the second is from *The Times*, September 26, 1887.

[56] *Times*, September 17, 1885.

[57] *The Liberal-Unionist*, I (April 13, 1887), 41.

[58] Ford, "John Morley in Politics," p. 212.

[59] A. G. Gardiner, *Prophets, Priests, and Kings* (London, 1914), p. 152.

speak to the manhood in Irishmen. It is to do them as we would be done by.[60]

One auditor who heard Morley speak cited a passage from his address to illustrate his ability to "touch politics with a certain spiritual emotion that makes it less a business or a game than a religion."[61] The quotation is a request for sympathetic understanding by Englishmen of Irish conduct. The plea is made in emotive language. It is enforced by the repetition and rhythm of conditional clauses followed by positive assertions. Again the climax is an ethical commonplace:

> Gentlemen . . . you must make allowances for the Irish. If they were often ignorant, it was your laws that for generations sealed the book of knowledge to them. If they were poor, it was your laws that allowed the landlords for generations to strip them of the fruits of their toil. If they are excessive . . . in their devotion to a Church which is not the Church of most of you, remember that the Church was their friend and comforter in the dark hour when they had no other. Gentlemen, do the Irish as you would be done by.

The importance of diction and sentence structure to Morley's purpose is demonstrated again in this passage. "Sealed the book of knowledge," "strip them of the fruits of their toil," "friend and comforter in the dark hour," elevate his thought. Morley might have written the passage with two assertions, omitting the conditional clauses: They were often ignorant; it was your laws. . . . They were poor; it was your laws. . . . But this construction is harsher, sharper, and blunter than Morley's. It has a tone of a charge rather than a plea; and the tone is not compatible with that of the ethical commonplace, "Do the Irish as you would be done by."

The eloquence of Morley's style, arising from his fervent enthusiasm for the ideas he expressed, was in sharp contrast to his obvious difficulties in delivery. According to one observer his lack of ease on the platform reinforced the total impression he made on audiences. He was a speaker in spite of himself:

> There was an unstudied downrightness of speech . . . which was strangely moving and was emphasized, rather than attenuated, by the awkward gestures, the husky voice, the ragged sentences—in strange contrast to the polish of his literary style, for he was an orator *malgré lui*—all of them leaving on the mind of the hearer the impression that he was wrestling with his very soul, as perhaps indeed he was.[62]

4.

John Morley does not merit a place in the select company of England's great orator-statesmen. In his parliamentary career his role was most often that of a public critic whose speeches examined and tested the principles on which political action was based. In this role he became a kind of conscience to his party, and he sought to guide it and his public in what he believed to be the direction of truth and justice. In spite of the fact that he was not a polished speaker, he enjoyed influence and appeal which sprang chiefly from the ethos derived from his general reputation and the principles according to which he selected his ideas, and from the literate precision with which he expressed himself. And his ability to infuse into politics a quality of conscience and instructed moral fervor was the mainspring of his activity, the basis of his reputation.

[60] *Times*, June 30, 1888; also appears in *Times*, March 20, 1890 and *Times*, July 6, 1892.

[61] Gardiner, *Prophets, Priests, and Kings*, p. 152. Text of passage is from *Times*, April 10, 1888.

[62] J. H. Morgan, "The Personality of Lord Morley," *The Quarterly Review*, CCLXI (April 1924), 351.

ALLA NAZIMOVA AND THE ADVENT OF THE NEW ACTING IN AMERICA

Clifford Ashby

ON November 13, 1906, a slight, dark Russian girl with a bare grasp of the English language played Hedda Gabler at a Broadway matinee. This performance signalled the beginning of a theatrical revolution that was to culminate rapidly in the almost complete acceptance of the realistic mode of acting in America. The actress was Alla Nazimova, first student of Constantin Stanislavsky to appear in this country.

A great deal of training had preceded Nazimova's debut, training of a kind unknown to Broadway theatre.[1] Born of wealthy, Jewish parents in Yalta in 1879, she received a private-school education in Switzerland, and seemed destined for a career as a violinist. However, as happens to children in even the best regulated of homes, this girl in her late teens became enamored of theatre, and over the usual parental objections, enrolled at Moscow's Philharmonic Society. Despite its name, the Philharmonic had in the 1890's one of Russia's best theatre schools: it was administered by Vladimir Nemirovitch-Dantchenko, later to become co-founder (with Stanislavsky) of the Moscow Art Theatre.

After three years of study, the twenty-year-old Nazimova graduated at the head of her class, playing the lead in Ibsen's *Little Eyolf* for the graduation performance. She was picked to receive an additional year's training with the newly formed Moscow Art company, and during this year appeared as extra in many of its productions.[2]

At the end of this year, the young actress had to make a decision: she could remain with the Moscow Art as a minor player and begin a slow climb toward the theatrical heavens, or she could have immediate stardom in the provinces.[3] She chose the provinces, and spent a season each in Kostroma, Kerson, and Vilna, playing over two hundred roles during this period.

The 1903 season found her in St. Petersburg, the Russian capital, playing in a theatre "across the river from the best part of the city; a theatre for working people, . . . a place where we gave serious plays with a message."[4] It was probably here that she first met Paul Orlenev, by profession one of Russia's leading actors, and by inclination a social revolutionary "in the manner of Gorki."[5]

Orlenev, who was to organize the troupe that brought Nazimova to America, was a man imbued with the realistic spirit of the Moscow Art Theatre, and according to one American interviewer, his company was "modeled

Mr. Ashby (M.A., Hawaii, 1953) is completing his doctorate at Stanford University. He previously taught at the University of Florida.

[1] The material presented here on Nazimova's life in Russia is drawn from numerous articles, interviews, and brief biographies.

[2] Owen Johnson, "Mme. Alla Nazimova," *Century Magazine*, LXXIV (June 1907), 219.

[3] Mary B. Mullett, "How a Dull, Fat Little Girl Became a Great Actress," *American Magazine*, XLIII (April 1922), 112.

[4] Quoted in Mullett, 112.

[5] Homer Saint-Gaudens, "The Russian Players," *The Critic*, XLVII (April 1906), 319.

upon Stanislavsky's."[6] Like the early leaders of the Moscow group, Orlenev believed that theatre must mirror reality, that "each action must be [true] to life."[7] For example, in preparing a production of *Crime and Punishment*, the handsome actor made an inspection of Russian prisons; and when playing in *Ghosts*, he visited the hospitals to become familiar "with the idiosyncracies characteristic of the affliction inherited by Oswald."[8]

Most of the publicity at the time of the tour stated that Orlenev's decision to leave Russia was motivated by his distaste for the restrictions imposed upon drama by the government censor, but it seems probable that the major impetus came from the enforced closing of the theatres following the Moscow riots of 1904. The company which he took abroad, the St. Petersburg Players, almost certainly had no existence in Russia prior to the trip. As a vehicle for the tour, Orlenev chose a pro-Jewish play which was interdicted in Russia, Chirikov's *The Chosen People*, and cast himself and Mme. Nazimova in leading roles. The actors were to play in their native Russian.

The St. Petersburg Players began their guest appearances in Berlin, in late 1904. According to interviews given later in New York by Orlenev, both the play and performers were well received. Their London opening in the same play was not so successful. *The Times*' reviewer was favorably impressed by the acting, but he found the play somber and undramatic. The didactic aspects of the drama upset him; he observed that "the dramatist . . . has no concern, as a dramatist, with the teaching or preaching of morals or anything else."[9] After a short stay in London the Russian company took ship for New York to begin a two-year stay in the New World.

American theatre at this time was going willy-nilly down the road to realism. Both scenery and playwriting were becoming increasingly true-to-life, but acting had not kept pace with the trend toward verisimilitude. The style of performance remained that of the preceding century: formalized, declamatory, melodramatic. Although the actor often found himself enclosed by a realistic box setting, examination of photographs from the period will show that his technique would have been more consonant with wings and drops.

This is not surprising when one considers that America had no equivalent of the Moscow Art or the Théâtre Libre where a new acting style could evolve. There were, of course, some indications of a movement away from Delsartean formalism, but there had never been, until Nazimova's English-speaking debut, a definitive example of the "new" acting. The stock company remained the only training school for the American actor, and that training was firmly rooted in the acting traditions of the nineteenth century.

America knew very little about Russian theatre when the St. Petersburg Players opened at the Herald Square Theatre on March 23, 1905. Occasional magazine articles had mentioned that a wealthy dilettante "whose name was variously reported as Starloffski and Stanislaus" was engaged in some kind of theatrical experimentation, but Moscow was still far from the dramatic Mecca that it was to become to Americans of the 1920's.

[6] "Paul Orleneff and His Company of Russian Players," *Theatre Magazine*, V (December 1905), xi.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Ibid.*, 315.

[9] *The Times* (London), January 23, 1905.

When these early apostles of realism made their Broadway debut, there was little publicity and none of the fanfare which usually precedes the appearance of a foreign attraction. Their audiences were not large, but they did attract some favorable critical attention. The *New York Times'* reviewer applauded the "naturalistic acting of the players from St. Petersburg," and felt that the play was "brilliantly interpreted." Mme. Nazimova's "inspired performance" was singled out for special praise, and it was noted, somewhat cryptically, that "if the actress was not living the part, she so nearly suggested it that the effect was much the same."[10]

Following the *succés d'estime* of *The Chosen People,* Orlenev moved his actors to a small lecture hall in the Russian Jewish section of New York where they began a season of repertory. Their first bill included Dostoievski's *Crime and Punishment* and *Brothers Karamazov,* Ibsen's *Ghosts,* Alexandroff's *Misery of Misfortune,* Alexis Tolstoi's *The Son of Ivan the Terrible,* and Strindberg's *Countess [Miss] Julie.* These plays were later followed by three more of Ibsen's, one by Chekhov, two by Gorki, and three by Hauptmann. Offerings such as these attracted for the company a large following from the *emigré* Jewish population, and they were a financial success—at least temporarily.[11]

It is not necessary here to trace the star-crossed path of the Russian group through two seasons of American theatre, incredible story though it may be. Orlenev was temperamentally unsuited to manage a theatre, and the record of his failures in the face of every opportunity is almost unbelievable. Subscriptions were raised by the Jewish community; society's Mrs. Whitney arranged a series of benefit matinees at the Criterion; theatre folk such as Ben Greet, Paul Herzog, and Charles Klein attempted to bring order to the company's affairs; Andrew Carnegie and J. P. Morgan made personal donations; Dan Frohman arranged a tour of Chicago and Boston. But all of these efforts met with the same results: hungry actors, importunate creditors, and general dissatisfaction. At one point, Mme. Nasimoff (as Nazimova was then known) retreated to Moscow, only to be lured back by Orlenev's assurance that a temple of the arts was being built in New York to house the St. Petersburg company. The temple never materialized; in 1906 a final subscription was raised, this one to return the Russians to their homeland.[12]

With even moderately good management, the coming of these actors to this country could have been one of the landmarks of modern American drama. As it is, their chief claim to historical note is that Alla Nazimova came from their ranks. For when the troupe departed for home, their leading lady remained in New York, having signed a five year contract with the Schuberts to act in English under their management.[13]

The debut of this Moscow-Art-trained actress was handled with great care. Henry Miller, himself an excellent actor and one sympathetic to the new concepts of acting,[14] was assigned as her

[10] *New York Times,* March 23, 1905.

[11] "Dollars flowed in a river. I remember we often departed from the show with suitcases crammed with dollars—gold, silver, and paper." Orlenev's *Memoirs,* quoted in Robert W. Shoemaker, "Russian Drama on the New York Stage from the Beginning to 1920," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1951, p. 70.

[12] Shoemaker, pp. 85-87.

[13] This was at a time when foreign stars almost invariably played in their native tongues, even though supporting casts might act in English.

[14] Cf. Henry Miller, "Realism in Acting," *Harper's Weekly,* L (January 6, 1906), 26.

stage manager. Rather than risk their new star in a full-blown evening production, the Schuberts let her begin a matinee run of *Hedda Gabler* in November of 1906.[15]

The actress from the Crimea was at once a success: critical praise of her portrayal of Hedda was full and unrestrained, and she was reckoned superior to Mrs. Fiske, who had become identified with the role. The *Times* concluded its adulatory review by stating: "She is, in short, one of the most remarkable actresses of the times."[16]

But a praiseworthy performance and favorable comments are not unusual in the theatre; actresses had opened to rave reviews before this. It was not until two months later, when Nazimova played Nora in *A Doll's House,* that the import of her kind of acting was realized. At this point, it became apparent to most critics that a revolution in the art of acting was beginning. For what seemed like the first time in New York theatrical history, an actress had portrayed two entirely different people. To the astonishment of the reviewers, Nazimova had displayed a distinctly different personality in each of the Ibsen roles.

"I rubbed my eyes in amaze," wrote Allan Dale in the *New York American.* "Was this the stately creature who had charmed us in *Hedda?* Was this the silent feline atrocity that had made the most impossible of Ibsen's plays possible? This Nora seemed smaller, slighter, cast in another mold."[17]

This was unheard-of; a star's stock-in-trade was her own very definite and winning personality; it was essential that this personality remain intact at all times. When Ethel Barrymore, a year earlier, had added whitening to her hair and essayed the role of the forty-year-old mother in Barrie's *Alice-Sit-By-The-Fire,* the result had been "the consternation of her peculiar public."[18] Miss Barrymore was still quite recognizable in the role, since she made no attempt to age her youthful countenance, but her fans were still upset; the grey-haired mother was not a proper Barrymore role.

Now, an actress appeared who, Proteus-like, could mold herself into any being. The *New York Times,* in a thoughtful Sunday article following her appearance in *A Doll's House,* commented that, "Her Nora is astonishing in its revelation of what might be termed a new personality—one as distinct and far removed from Hedda as possible." The writer, probably Adolph Klauber, concluded that, "The Russian woman is a genius."[19]

Dale, in comparing the two performances, noted that, "In *A Doll's House* Mme. Nazimova was no longer the tall, silent creature of uncanny pose, but a small, frisky, girlish mischievous child-wife." He added, "You saw the actress in the part, not the part in the actress."[20] *Theatre Magazine* observed: "That she is able to impersonate two such widely divergent characters with the consummate skill which she has evidenced, speaks wonders for the rare versatility of her polished art."[21] Even *The New York Dramatic Mirror,* published by the hus-

[15] It was at this time that "Nasimoff" became "Nazimova." Since "a" is the normal feminine ending in Russian, it is difficult to understand why the masculine version was ever used.

[16] *New York Times,* November 14, 1906.

[17] January 15, 1907.

[18] Forrest Izard, *Heroines of the Modern Stage* (New York, 1915), p. 352.

[19] January 20, 1907.

[20] "Nazimova and Some Others," *Cosmopolitan,* XLII (April 1907), 675.

[21] VII (March 1907), 72.

band of the celebrated Mrs. Fiske, noted with astonishment "the apparent change in stature, gesture, voice, and soul that made the audience wonder if this could be the same woman acting."[22]

Owen Johnson found that "The advent to the American stage of the Russian actress, Mme. Alla Nazimova, is more than the opening of a great career. *It is significant both of the evolution of the drama and the development of dramatic interpretation.*"[23] [italics added]

Praise for Nazimova's accomplishments was not quite universal. There were some, like actor-playwright William Gillette, who were fated to spend the rest of their lives advocating a return to the "Palmy Days, when there was acting that amounted to something."[24] Crotchety, Ibsen-hating William Winter was one of those who saw no good in the coming of the Russian actress.

Winter, then dramatic editor of the *New York Tribune*, did not review the production of *Hedda Gabler*. The Sunday following this obviously disapproving silence, there appeared a two column advertisement in the theatre section of the *Tribune* headed: "OPINIONS OF FAMOUS ARTISTS AND CRITICS CONCERNING ALLA NAZIMOVA'S MARVELOUS PERFORMANCE OF 'HEDDA GABLER.'" The body of the advertisement consisted of complimentary quotations from seven reigning stars and seven newspaper reviewers.[25]

Winter responded to the challenge offered by this advertisement. Following the opening of *A Doll's House*, an unsigned review couched in Winter's most venomous accents, observed that, "Mrs. Gabler's diseased condition has been on view for some time, but the votaries of the matinee can not refresh themselves with the semi-infantile, semi-hysterical, altogether idiotic proceedings of Mrs. Helmer." While terming the play "hackneyed, insipid, and tedious," he did grudgingly concede that "Mme. Nazimova is a pretty woman, from Russia, who uses the English language in an effective manner, although with some difficulty."[26] In later years, he was to rescind even this faint praise, and refer to the Russian actress as one "of the twisting, twining, serpentine sisterhood—lithesome creatures, who make their eyes large and round, readily fall into convulsions, and with reckless violence, precipitate themselves upon the floor."[27]

Such criticism had little effect; the transmutable acting of Nazimova had become The Way To Act. The once redoubtable stars of the stage became "those nice, amiable, well-spoken people who are the same in everything they do, who are always marmalade though they may be labeled strawberry jam, and whose limitations are as well defined as those of any map."[28]

The *New York Times* summed up the discussion in this manner:

> Our actresses' personalities are as well known as their names. Managers recognize the fact, and so do playwrights. On one role, you will find the unmistakeable Ethel Barrymore stamp, on another that of Annie Russell. Clara Bloodgood is identified with a type, and Virginia Harned with another. Maude Adams has been known to escape from herself in *l'Aiglon* and in that pathetic slavey she acted a year or two ago, but she is mostly a variant of her own engaging self. Even Mrs. Fiske, accomplished artiste that she is, is Mrs. Fiske in varying moods and manners. The greatest artists of the theatre are those able to escape the confines of

[22] January 26, 1907, p. 3.
[23] Johnson, p. 219.
[24] *The Illusion of the First Time in Acting* (New York, 1915), p. 38.
[25] November 18, 1906.
[26] January 15, 1907.
[27] *The Wallet of Time* (New York, 1913), II, 589.
[28] Dale, "Nazimova and Some Others," p. 676.

self, whose individualities are so plastic that they may be shaped into other beings, who are capable of taking their own clay, so to speak, and fashioning it into distinct models. . . . With those who successively appear as transient adornments of a local stage, Alla Nazimova has little in common.[29]

For a brief moment, the diminutive actress stood in the van of a "growing public sense of the drama as an art, of which acting is a component part, not the chief end."[30] From the many interviews and articles which followed Nazimova's initial appearances, it is possible to see how her approach to a role differed from the standard Broadway practices of the period.

The actor of the early 1900's worked from "sides," abbreviated scripts containing only his own lines and the necessary cues. Lines were memorized mechanically, with little attention paid to the import of the scene or the speeches of other characters. Some actors, E. H. Sothern for one, made it a practice to have their roles word perfect *before* the first rehearsal.[31] Study of the whole script was regarded as nonessential, since an actor was only concerned with his own part.

Nazimova worked like this:

I read the play without any special attention to my own part six or seven times. I think not at all of my part, but always of the plot and the central theme and the play of the characters upon each other. Then I consider what the other characters say of the character I am to play. Having gotten this concept of her well defined, I think of her character as she speaks of it herself and as it is disclosed by what she says. Then I get further into the part by reading what she says herself, not with a view to learning my lines, but getting acquainted with her. When the scenery has been painted, the costumes selected, everything ready for rehearsals, not till then do I learn my lines. I am afraid to practice the reading before because I might read them wrong and the improper tone or inflection might become fixed upon my mind and I would not forget it.[32]

Most acting of the time was declamatory. Nazimova's was not:

Almost every day at rehearsal the actors would mistake some of my lines for directions I was giving them—just because I simply talked my words.[33]

American actors had not learned that in realistic drama the true meaning of a speech lay below the surface, that a line such as, "I think it's going to rain," could be filled with deep psychological significance. The Russian-trained actress noted that:

The trouble here is that people make a mystery of Ibsen. . . . You take what he wrote exactly and literally as he wrote it.[34]

Roles, once created, were performed by rote, with never-varying detail. Nazimova's acting relied on the inspiration of the moment to give spontaneity to her performance:

Her imagination is so alert that it is impossible for her to play twice alike. Yet this process of constant experimentation is not due to outside study so much as it is to the impulse that moves her on her first entrance.[35]

There are other innovations which may be noted: the use of costume and makeup as carefully particularized aids in character delineation, the concept of ensemble acting, faithfulness to the author's overlying intention—these are but a few.

From a present-day standpoint, all of these revolutionary ideas are little more than the commonplaces of any "studio" actor, but they were blinding revelations to American theatre in 1907. Nazimova

[29] January 20, 1907.
[30] Izard, p. 349.
[31] George Middleton, *These Things Are Mine* (New York, 1947), p. 288.
[32] Quoted in "Russian Artiste Becomes an American Star," *Theatre Magazine*, VII (January 1907), pp. 13 & vii.
[33] *New York Times*, November 18, 1906.
[34] *Ibid.*
[35] Johnson, p. 224. Lawrence Langner confirms this observation in *The Magic Curtain* (New York, 1951), p. 258.

had fired the opening shot of a revolution that was won almost before the battle was joined. Literally overnight, critical opinion swung against the leading stars of the day, and the public quickly followed.

Some of the actresses of the day responded to the new demands of public taste: those who could not or would not change their acting styles passed rapidly from the public's fancy. Ethel Barrymore, one actress who weathered the transition, put aside the ultra-fashionable frocks of Madame Trentoni, in *Captain Jinks,* and in the spring of 1907 appeared in the rags of a charwoman in Galsworthy's *The Silver Box.* This was too much for her public and the play failed; but in 1910 she had a success with the new style in Pinero's *Mid-Channel.*

By 1915, it was possible to write with at least some degree of truth, "The day of the stars has passed."[36] The once-prized personality had become a quality to be submerged rather than exploited. William Gillette, an actor unable to adapt to the new ways, had this sardonic comment to offer on personality in 1913:

> The very word must send an unpleasant shudder through this highly sensitive assembly; for it is supposed to be quite proper and the highly cultured thing to sneer at Personality as an altogether cheap affair and not worthy to be associated for a moment with what is highest in Dramatic Art.[37]

It would, of course, be foolish to argue that the star system and the personality actor has ever gone through a period of total eclipse. But, as one writer put it in 1915:

> The stage is struggling, rather blindly, to liberate itself from the conventions that intervene between the audience and the play. As an incident in that liberation, the star system is on its way, not to destruction, for the actor of genius will always remain a compelling figure, but at least to broad modification. Starless casts and repertory companies have been plentiful enough to indicate the beginnings of a strong, new current.[38]

Nazimova was to go on to a long and varied career in American theatre: the toast of Broadway with a theatre named for her, Hollywood stardom in the early 20's at a salary of thirteen thousand dollars a week, an artistic rebirth with Eva Le Gallienne's Civic Repertory, roles with the Theatre Guild, the long tour of *Ghosts,* and finally, little-old-lady roles in the movies.

Alla Nazimova was undoubtedly one of the greatest actresses ever to appear on the American stage. She had a rare combination of talent, temperament, a kind of transmutable beauty, taste, intelligence, and over all a sense of artistic integrity. Throughout a career which spanned forty years of American drama, she remained a special favorite of the judicious theatre-goer who differentiated between gold and sheer glitter. Her influence on the art of acting in this country is incalculable. "I think of all actors she was, certainly to my generation of apprentices, the most intensely studied and quoted,"[39] wrote one admirer at the time of her death in 1945.

There are many people today who retain vivid, moment-by-moment impressions of a Nazimova performance from twenty or even thirty years ago. Seeing the woman from Yalta has remained a memorable event in many a person's theatrical experience. But Alla Nazimova was more than simply a noteworthy performer; she was an actress whose career constituted an important contribution to the progress of modern drama.

[36] Izard, p. 347.
[37] Gillette, p. 45.
[38] Izard, p. 349.
[39] Kappo Phelan, "Alla Nazimova," (obit.) *Commonweal,* XLVIII (August 3, 1945), 381.

BLOOMFIELD'S "NON-SYLLABIC" CLUSTERS

David B. Strother

WHILE examining Leonard Bloomfield's explanation of the "non-syllabic" clusters which occur in the English language, it seemed to me that his description, covering three pages, could be simplified to enable the interested reader to perceive the structural behavior of initial and final clusters quickly and vividly.[1]

So before presenting an interpretation of Bloomfield's "non-syllabic" clusters, I will define the terminology used in this article.

An *utterance* is a "single instance of speech."[2]

A *syllabic* is a phoneme at the "crest of sonority" in relation to the phonemes which "immediately precede or follow."[3]

Non-syllabics are phonemes of an utterance which remain.

The clusters may be divided into initial, final, and medial clusters. *Initial clusters* occur before the first syllabic of an utterance. *Final clusters* occur after the last syllabic of an utterance. In English, these clusters may consist of two, three, or four non-syllabics. The core will consist of a *main final* which, according to Bloomfield, "may be preceded by a *pre-final*, which in turn may be preceded by a *second pre-final*; further, the main final may be followed by a *post final*."[4] *Medial clusters*, which are omitted in this interpretation, contain "all the combinations of final plus initial clusters."[5]

Finally, IPA symbols are used in place of the Bloomfieldian symbols [š], [ž], [č], and [j].

The schematic arrangement on the next page represents my interpretation and simplification of Bloomfield's explanation of the "non-syllabic" clusters. Its primary value is to the speech therapist who can expand an articulation test to include not only words containing each of these sounds within a syllabic environment but also systematic arrangements of words containing clusters of two, three, and four sounds as well.

Limitations of the schematic arrangement result from apparent omissions of certain clusters in both the initial and in the final positions. For example, in the initial position, if one accepts as valid the research report on *One-Syllable Words* compiled by Moser, Dreher, and Oyer of Ohio State University, there are ten words in the English language containing various combinations of [ʃm], [ʃn], [skl], [sv], and [ts] which do not appear in this arrangement.[6] In the final positions, there appear to be, also, other combinations or clusters which are not readily apparent in this schematic arrangement. It is possible, of course, that Bloomfield overlooked certain combinations unintentionally or that his definition of a "non-syllabic" precluded certain combinations which others might construe to be consonantal.

Mr. Strother (Ph.D., University of Illinois, 1958) is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Washington.

[1] Leonard Bloomfield, *Language* (New York, 1933), pp. 131-134.

[2] Barnard Block, "A Set of Postulates for Phonemic Analysis," *Language*, XXIV (1954), 7. Block continues, ". . . length or inclusiveness of utterances can be ignored."

[3] Bloomfield, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 132.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 134.

[6] Henry Moser, John J. Dreher, and Herbert J. Oyer, *One-Syllable Words*. A Report Prepared by the Ohio State Research Foundation (Columbus, 1957). The compilations do not appear on numbered pages.

INITIAL CLUSTERS

• C: All Except [ŋ],[ʒ]

CC:

[k, g] + [w, r, l]

[t, d, θ, ʃ] + [w, r]

[p, f, b] + [r, l]

[h] + [w]

[s] + [p, t, k, f, m, n, w, l]

CCC:

[s] + [p, t] + [r, l] **

[s] + [k] + [w, r]

FINAL CLUSTERS

C: All Except [w],[j],[h]

2nd Pre-final		Pre-final		Final		Post-final
					CC:	
				[ʒ, ð, ŋ, r, v, b, m]	+	[d, z]
	+ syllabic +			[k, θ, p, f, t, ʃ]	+	[t, s] **
				[ʒ, z, dʒ]	+	[d]
				[s, ʃ]	+	[t]
				[d]	+	[z]
			CCC:			
		[m]	+	[p, t, f, θ]	+	post final ***
		[n]	+	[t, d, tʃ, dʒ, s, z]	+	post final ***
		[ŋ]	+	[k, θ]	+	post final ***
		[s]	+	[p, k]	+	"
		[d]	+	[θ, z]	+	"
		[r, l]	+	C	+	"
					CCCC:	
[k, r]	+ [s, m] +	[t, θ]	+			"

•C symbolizes a single "non-syllabic;" CC symbolize two "non-syllabics," etc.

••There are no utterances in English which begin with [stl] or end with [tʃs].

•••A *post-final* "non-syllabic" cannot follow an identical *final* "non-syllabic."

RHETORICAL GENRES IN DAVENANT'S *FIRST DAY'S ENTERTAINMENT AT RUTLAND HOUSE*

Jackson I. Cope

WHEN Sir William Davenant presented *The Siege of Rhodes* at Rutland House, he made the huddled stage of his mansion a landmark in English dramatic history. A few weeks earlier, on May 23, 1656, without the benefit of John Webb's elaborate perspectives, Davenant had presented his *First Day's Entertainment at Rutland House*. This performance was clearly a lure for the more ambitious "opera" which would be presented later in the summer: an epilogue to the *Entertainment* taunts those in the audience who might have come "To see us weave in the dramatic loom" with a hypothetical summary of the plot reminiscent of cavalier romantic plays and with the conclusion: "These were your plays, but get them if you can."[1] Like the text of *The Siege of Rhodes*, published before the performance,[2] this was a veiled promise that the poet's hand would soon return to the weaving of stage plots. But if the *Entertainment* was prologue for plays to come rather than itself the first public play of the Restoration years, yet it is inaccurate to describe it as consisting "simply of a debate, or rather of two monologues . . . padded out . . . not only with original songs and instrumental selections but with an additional debate between a Parisian and a Londoner."[3] However, the suggestion that the controversy between Diogenes and Aristophanes is "monologue" rather than "debate" brings us close to the mark, insofar as it opens the way to see that Davenant was exploiting two familiar non-dramatic genres, both of a rhetorical origin and both widely familiar.

Aristotle's permission for the orator to arouse his audience's resentment as one of the means of exhortation and dehortation (*Rhet.* III.14) may explain Diogenes' opening gambit: "But why should I desire your attention? for, considering, that when you are asleep, you neither hurt your friends, nor provoke your enemies, I think 'tis scarce discretion to keep you awake." And the philosopher proceeds to argue against the gathering of crowds, against the representation of virtue, against music, and against the effect of scenic illusion. Aristophanes then turns upon Diogenes, but the substance of his speech is a panegyric upon the theatre. Each Greek is presenting a separate prolusion, one

Mr. Cope (Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1952) is Associate Professor of English at The Rice Institute. During 1958-1959 he is in Italy working on a book on Ben Jonson. His Joseph Glanvil, Anglican Apologist *appeared in 1956.*

[1] *The Dramatic Works of Sir William D'Avenant*, ed. Maidment and Logan (Edinburgh, 1872-4), III, 229-30.

[2] Leslie Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928), p. 151. On D'Avenant's involvement in earlier "entertainments" see pp. 139-49.

[3] Arthur H. Nethercot, *Sir William D'Avenant: Poet Laureate and Playwright-Manager* (Chicago, 1938), pp. 305-6. Cf. similar dismissals in Alfred Harbage, *Cavalier Drama* (New York, 1936), p. 211; Alfred Harbage, *Sir William Davenant, Poet Venturer, 1606-1668* (Philadelphia, 1935), pp. 121-3. Cf. *Pepys' Diary*, Feb. 7, 1663/4.

of those good-natured, elaborately logical, catechetical and pseudo-sensible orations which were so important a part of University training when Davenant was at Oxford,[4] and which retained enough appeal that Milton's publisher issued the poet's juvenilia in the genre in 1674, nearly fifty years after their composition. Davenant's choice of form, however, was probably influenced less by the school exercises themselves than by the mock encomium, a closely allied phenomenon which was at a peak of popularity in the fifties.[5] It should be recalled that the paradoxical panegyric had its ideational origin in Zeno and its literary ancestry in the Ciceronian *Paradoxa Stoicorum*; that its heredity was that of serious persuasion as well as amusing irony. The persuasive intent persisted in Erasmus' *Encomium moriae*, in John Hall's prolix *Paradoxes* (1650), and in Davenant's "orations." For Davenant's speakers are propagandists, and, as Hotson observes, "The harangues of Diogenes, while ostensibly against opera, actually argue for it; so that Aristophanes finds it easy to drive home his own arguments with ridicule."[6] The point is made by such passages as the following, where two or three ironic words make the whole blatantly ambiguous:

> Does not the extasy of music transport us beyond the regions of reason? Changing the sober designs of discretion into the very wildness of dreams; urging softer minds to aim at the impossible successes of love; and enkindling in the active the destructive ambitions of war? Does it not turn the heads of the young till they grow so giddy, as if they walk'd on pinacles; and often divert the feet of the aged from a funeral to a wedding?[7]

And if the performance concluded with "songs relating to the Victor (the Protector)," songs never published,[8] yet the ambiguity cuts deeper than a defense of banned drama when Diogenes remarks to the audience on their meetings in the "Agora": "There is your annual feast where you devour your governors, or shift them nimbly as your trenchers before they are foul."[9] And a Puritan in the house might have stirred uneasily at Aristophanes' parting shot: "[Diogenes] hath much reason to dissuade you from moral representations, because he is himself the worst representation of morality; and justly afraid to be represented in the theatre."[10]

Having sown the seeds for a return of public drama, Davenant turns to less topical matters, but it is unfair to assert that he has simply "padded out" his two hours' traffic (III, 228) with another debate. If partisanship and significance slacken,[11] the literary appeal of the last section of the *Entertainment* rises climactically above that of the op-

[4] See Charles E. Mallet, *A History of the University of Oxford* (London, 1924), II, 323-8; James Bass Mullinger, *Cambridge Characteristics in the Seventeenth Century* (London and Cambridge, 1867), pp. 50-3. On Davenant at Oxford see Nethercot, *D'Avenant*, pp. 23-7.

[5] See Henry Knight Miller, "The Paradoxical Encomium with Special Reference to its Vogue in England, 1600-1800," *MP*, LIII (1956), 145-78. Such collections as *Wits Interpreter*, 1655, and *Choyce Drollery, Wit and Drollery*, and *Parnassus Biceps*, all 1656, provided contemporary examples of this tongue-in-cheek rhetoric for Davenant's "first day's" audience.

[6] Hotson, p. 150.

[7] *Dramatic Works*, III, 204.

[8] Hotson, p. 150.

[9] *Dramatic Works*, III, 200. The Greek characters, of course, served to disguise decently the contemporary issues. But it is probable that Diogenes and Aristophanes were specifically suggested by Thomas Stanley's *History of Philosophy*, which included in parts issued in 1655-56 translations both of Aristophanes' *Clouds* and of Diogenes Laertius' account of Diogenes. At any rate, both orations draw upon details of Diogenes Laertius' characterization of the cynic (such as Plato's tu quoque on Diogenes' pride: *Dramatic Works*, III, 208).

[10] *Dramatic Works*, III, 213.

[11] Hotson suggests that "the amusing controversy between the Londoner and the Parisian . . . flatters the government by contemning the French who harbor the exiled Stuart court. . . ." (p. 151). But actually, Parisian and Londoner come off quits, and there is no support in the dialogue for Hotson's interpretation.

ening orations, as Davenant turns to a more polished genre.

The style alters and falls into a steadier Senecan amble as French and English spokesmen replace the Greeks at the gilded rostra:

> But I have a mind to suppose, under your favour, that your heads are bottles, and your brains the cork; for the one, being a little stirred, the others fly out, and fill the room with froth.
>
> These are your feasts, which are but fasts to your servants . . . for which your sufficient reason is, because such as are ordained to service, should be continually allay'd by temperance, lest they might lose obedience.[12]

The increase in balance and wit is a function of generic decorum, for Davenant is here writing in the tradition of the "character," that genre which had allied conceits, sharply pointed antitheses, and satire as its hallmark. It is true that in the fifties the character had been widely assimilated to polemics, and that portrait-characters, satiric and apologetic, dominated a genre which often ran over into essay or tract.[13] But the classic collections such as Earle's *Microcosmographie* and the *Overburian Characters* were still being reprinted in these years.[14] The latter collection contained a character of a "prison," probably writen by Thomas Dekker,[15] which originated a fairly extensive vogue for institutional "characters"—witty sketches of typical scenes and activities which serve to mirror the spirit of "place." It is such pleasantly satiric descriptions of London and of Paris, the two halves of the aging royalist's divided heart, which Davenant has written for the *First Day's Entertainment at Rutland House.* And if we look at the dialogue in this light, we can cease to regret the lack of a dramatic organization which was never intended and give Davenant his due homage as one of the last vividly successful practitioners of that genre which the seventeenth century made its own. He could sustain a skipping, witty balance as well as the Overburians: "We plant the vineyard, and you drink the wine; by which you beget good spirits, and we get good money. You keep open houses for all that bring you in mirth, till your estates run out of doors, and find new landlords."[16] And only Earle among his predecessors was capable of wedding a precisely fitting symbolic joke to the sentimental realism with which Davenant closes his work on a dying fall:

> When I consider both our cities, I conclude they were built and are inhabited by mortal men. . . . If I could reach your hand, I would endeavour to kiss it; for I should account my self worse bred than in a forest, if I had not learned a little from the abundant civility of Paris; where I have heard of two aged crocheteurs, heavy loaden with billets, who were so equally concerned in the punctilios of salutation, and of giving the way, that with the length of ceremony, *"monsieur c'est a vous, monsieur vous vous moques de vostre serviteur,"* they both sunk under their burdens, and so died, dividing the eternal honour of genty education.[17]

Shakerly Marmion had brought Earle's

[12] *Dramatic Works,* III, 225, 226. One recalls Davenant's recognition of the age's Senecan bias in the preface to *Gondibert:* "Young men . . . proceed to the admiration of what are commonly call'd *Conceits,* things that sound like the knacks or toyes of ordinary *Epigrammatists,* and from thence . . . grow up to some force of *Fancy" (Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century,* ed. J. E. Spingarn [Oxford, 1908], II, 21-22).

[13] See Benjamin Boyce, *The Polemic Character: 1640-1661* (Lincoln, Nebr., 1955), esp. pp. 101-111.

[14] *Microcosmographie* was twice reprinted in 1650, and many of its pieces were also plagiarized in *The Mirrour of Complements,* an anonymous collection of the same year. The Overbury collection appeared anew in 1655 (see Chester Noyes Greenough, *A Bibliography of the Theophrastan Character in English* [Cambridge, Mass., 1947]).

[15] *The Overburian Characters,* ed. W. J. Paylor (Oxford, 1936), pp. xxv-xxxi.

[16] *Dramatic Works,* III, 218.

[17] *Dramatic Works,* III, 228.

"antiquary" onto the stage as a dramatic protagonist, and other playwrights, professional and cavalier amateur alike, had incorporated "characters" into their plays since Ben Jonson had shown the way.[18] This was inevitable, because the Theophrastan technique was associated with *descriptio* in the rhetorical handbooks long before Theophrastus' characters became widely known and accessible to the Renaissance reader.[19] Clearly such a technique had to manifest itself prominently in a drama so conscious of rhetorical precept and so declamatory as that of the sixteenth century. But even as Jonson was acclimating something like the "character" proper to the stage, it was moving from an oratorical technique into a new life as a purely literary genre.[20] The stage lost what became the character book, and it is in Davenant's *Entertainment* alone, I believe, that we discover the "character" in the full richness of its literary development returning to its spoken origins.

[18] Benjamin Boyce, *The Theophrastan Character in England to 1642* (Cambridge, Mass., 1947), pp. 306-15.

[19] Boyce, *Theophrastan Character*, pp. 3-121, discusses the developments in rhetoric, moral satire, and drama which created the "character" genre.

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 99-108.

* * *

SEVENTEEN WHO MADE HISTORY— THE FOUNDERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

Andrew Thomas Weaver

Our life is like some vast lake that is slowly filling with the stream of our years. As the waters creep surely upward, the landmarks of the past are, one by one, submerged. But there shall always be memory to lift its head until the lake is overflowing.—*Alexandre Bisson.*

GO back with me to November 28th, 1913. The National Council of Teachers of English is holding its annual convention in Chicago. A committee reports the results of a survey of opinion among those teaching what we now call speech, concerning the advisability of forming a new national association. Forty-one have voted to remain in the English Council; and ten have expressed a preference for the existing Speech Arts Association. No action is taken.

One year later, November 27th, 1914, another ballot shows 57 for an independent association of teachers of public speaking, and 56 for continuing as a section of the English Council. A motion is made "That a National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking be organized." A long debate ensues, and then, by a vote of 18 to 16, the motion is laid on the table. On the following morning, 17 men, representing 13 different institutions, vote unanimously to establish our Association.

Mr. Weaver (Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1923; LL.D., Carroll, 1946) is Professor of Speech at the University of Wisconsin. He was one of the earliest members of our Association, and for many years was Chairman of the Department of Speech at the University of Wisconsin. *The present paper was presented at a meeting of the SAA on December 30, 1958, during the convention in Chicago.*

It is intriguing to speculate on what must have happened along the way as the 113 who had voted on November 27th dwindled to 34, and then to 17. This strange shrinkage suggests the story of the executive who, in calling for a vote on a policy which he had proposed, said: "All those in favor please say 'Aye'; all those opposed, please say, 'I resign.' "

Believing with Sir Winston Churchill that the further backward we can look, the further forward we can see, I ask that you turn your eyes back half a century and contemplate with me those seventeen charter members to whom we owe so much. In doing this we are not concerning ourselves with the dead past which should be left to bury its dead; rather, we are seeking to make this present generation realize that it is riding on the shoulders of its forebears. Only thus can we assure the continuance of our growth, and, as John Buchan has said, pay our debt to the past by putting the future in debt to ourselves.

I suppose that I am the only person at this meeting who was present at the birth of our Association. I shall never cease to regret that when our great charter was drawn up, two score and four years ago, I failed to sign it. As Harold Blake Walker recently wrote, "The decisive battles of the world are fought between militant minorities, with the masses of men on the fence, watching the struggle." The one compensation that I have enjoyed for remaining on the sidelines on that historic occasion, is that my mistake has left me

free to praise those intrepid adventurers who there launched out on the wave of the future.

In these days of our professional prosperity, I wonder if we appreciate the climate of insecurity in which the teachers of our subject lived a half century ago. At the time of our founding, no college offered a major in our field, to say nothing of graduate study. Most of us worked in an environment of suspicion, hostility, or even contempt. The old Speech Arts Association was dominated by teachers of elocution and expression, and by platform entertainers. Those college teachers of public speaking who had sought refuge in departments of English had become convinced that they had but leaped from the griddle into the flames.

For the founders of The National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking every term in that title had special significance. The organization was to be "national" rather than sectional. It was to be composed of "academic teachers" rather than artists and studio coaches. "Public speaking" was designed to make it clear that attention was to be focused on direct, communicative public address rather than on the half-horse-half-alligator antics of the elocutionists. Our founding fathers believed, almost passionately, that unless artificial and extravagant exhibitionism were abandoned, their courses could never win academic acceptance.

It has been said that no one has changed the course of history so much as historians. Though it was my privilege to know all our charter members personally, I am mindful of the inability of any single witness to make an impartial evaluation of any other person. Moreover, I am keenly aware of the perils of creative memory. Starting from this background of caution, let me characterize each of the seventeen. Reserving three of them for later treatment in somewhat ampler scope, I shall first present thumbnail vignettes of fourteen of the seventeen, taking them in alphabetical order.

Isaac Merton Cochran of Carleton College was born in 1872 and died in 1943. He was a public reader and actor of rare ability. Coaching orators and debaters was his favorite educational activity. A man of simple tastes and incorruptible integrity, he commanded the devotion of his students and the respect of his fellow citizens.

Arthur Loren Gates of Miami University (Ohio) was born in 1886 and died in 1940. He was a quiet, reserved, and cultured gentleman. Although he was interested in the whole gamut of speech training, he was best known as a lecturer, interpreter, actor, and theatre director.

Joseph Searle Gaylord of Winona State Normal School was born in 1860 and died in 1956. Later in life he taught at Wisconsin and Northwestern. His special interests were psychology and pedagogy. He was blessed with phenomenal physical stamina and his long life was marked by an insatiable appetite for learning. He believed and taught that physical culture was prerequisite to all intellectual discipline.

Haldor Gislason of the University of Minnesota was born in 1875 and died in 1947. He was a native of Iceland. Modest, generous, and scholarly, he was greatly beloved as a teacher. Prior to 1914, as a working member of the Speech Arts Association, he had sought diligently to promote a transition from elocution to public speaking. He was a charter member of Delta Sigma Rho. He was also the first Secretary of our Association.

HARRY BAINBRIDGE GOUGH of DePauw University was born in 1871 and died in 1945. He was an ordained minister. He is memorable for his kindliness and for his flawless courtesy in dealing with others. For forty years, he was identified with DePauw where he built a model college department. He was our eighth President.

BINNEY GUNNISON of Lombard College was born in 1863 and died in 1946. He was a gentle little fellow, a stimulating teacher, and a successful platform artist. Later in life he became President of the School of Expression in Boston. He too was an ordained minister.

CLARION DEWITT HARDY of Northwestern University was born in 1877 and died in 1936. He was an unusually effective practitioner of the public speaking skills which he taught to business men and college students. Sincerity and forthrightness were his key virtues. He sent out the questionnaires which led directly to the founding of our Association. He was known as a good and faithful servant to the community in which he lived.

JAMES LAWRENCE LARDNER of Northwestern University was born in 1873 and still lives out in Skokie, near Evanston. He is a man of perfect urbanity and uncommon common sense. At Northwestern he served first as Professor of Public Speaking in the College of Liberal Arts and later as Professor of Literary Interpretation in the School of Speech. He was our third President.

GLENN NEWTON MERRY of the State University of Iowa was born in 1886 and now lives in New York. He earned the first doctor's degree ever awarded for laboratory research in our field. Thus, he early exemplified the ideal of scientific scholarship about which others were writing and talking. At the 1917 convention, he introduced the resolution endorsing the use of the term Speech by departments and by the Association. In 1924 he left us to enter business administration. He was our first Business Manager and our seventh President.

J. MANLEY PHELPS of the University of Illinois was born in 1891 and now lives in Chicago where he teaches at DePaul University. He has achieved notable success as the organizer of "Better Speech" and "Better English" institutes.

FRANK MILLER RARIG of the University of Minnesota was born in 1880 and now lives in retirement in Minneapolis. He is universally regarded as one of the most rugged and durable personalities in our profession. He has specialized in pedagogy and psychology. He believes that mental hygiene is the handmaiden of speech training. His name is forever synonymous, in our field, with the great university which he served so long and so well. He was our fourteenth President.

LEW SARETT of the University of Illinois was born in 1888 and died in 1954. He achieved a distinguished triple career as poet, lecturer, and teacher. He brought great gifts to our profession and we shall not look upon his like again. He taught persuasion and pedagogy at Northwestern. He served as Secretary of our Association in 1918-19.

BENJAMIN CARLTON VAN WYE of the University of Cincinnati was born in 1876 and died in 1940. He was a devout apostle of the doctrine that speech training should be provided for everyone and not restricted to the gifted few, and he did much to make this ideal one of the foundation stones in our professional philosophy.

IRVAH LESTER WINTER of Harvard University was born in 1857 and died in 1934. He was a conservative, Back Bay Bostonian to the core. His career was an interesting paradox. Up until 1914, he had staunchly maintained that all teachers of public speaking should be members of departments of English. Never, in all his years at Harvard, did he raise his voice for departmental autonomy, and he died happy in the thought that his courses were receiving regular English credit. Yet on that November day in 1914, he signed our declaration of independence and, in one shining hour, forgot himself into immortality.

Permit me to make it crystal clear that I intend no disparagement of others when I assign particular credit to three men who, in my opinion, played roles of special significance in organizing our Association. These three were: JAMES MILTON O'NEILL of the University of Wisconsin, born in 1881 and now living in Lakeville, Connecticut; CHARLES HENRY WOOLBERT of the University of Illinois, born in 1877 and died in 1929; and JAMES ALBERT WINANS of Cornell University, born in 1871 and died in 1956.

"Jim" O'Neill was the sparkplug of the rebellion. In my judgment, he more than any other man deserves the title, Father of our Association. Clear-headed, hard-hitting, loving argument and controversy, he preached and practised a strategy of overwhelming assault against the entrenchments of whatever he considered wrong. Never dismayed by reverses, never plagued by doubts concerning the righteousness of his crusade, he drove straight forward to his goals. As was once said of another irrepressible optimist, "Show him an egg and instantly the air is filled with feathers." He was our first President and our first Editor.

"Charlie" Woolbert was the dynamo of the revolution. I think that he possessed the most fertile and original mind among the seventeen. His writing, profound and prolific, is a rich professional heritage. He was a typical nonconformist, intellectually inquisitive, quick-tempered, and at times tactless, but always contagiously enthusiastic and in dead earnest. A dedicated disciple of the truth as he saw it, he was an amazingly effective evangelist for the causes to which he committed himself. Having been frustrated in every attempt to win independence for Speech at Illinois, he spent his final days in the well-established department at the State University of Iowa. He was our fourth President and our second Editor.

"Jim" Winans was the balance wheel of the movement. Cautious, conservative, a bit negatively suggestible, preferring subtle and indirect methods in attaining his objectives, he was, nevertheless, capable of a withering blast of rhetoric against ideas and proposals uncongenial to him. As a member of the Speech Arts Association, for a decade he had campaigned against the crimes and misdemeanors of the elocutionists. His intimate and accurate knowledge of the contemporary currents running in the academic world was an immense asset to our organization in its formative years. His was the clearest voice raised in support of the thesis that research was prerequisite to recognition in the university world. His was one of the authentic seminal minds among the seventeen; he was content to sow the seeds of scholarship in his students and then patiently wait for the maturing harvest. He was our second President.

O'Neill, Woolbert, Winans—what a triumvirate! Articles such as O'Neill's "The Professional Outlook," Woolbert's "The Place of Logic in a System of Persuasion," and Winans' "The Need for Research" should be required reading for all who seek to orient themselves to the modern Speech world.

The average age of the seventeen was 36: Phelps, the youngest, was 23; Winter, the oldest, was 57. They represented: 4 liberal arts colleges; 4 state universities; 3 private universities; and 1 normal school. All of the institutions were in the East and the Middle West; none were in the Deep South or the Far West. Seven of the seventeen became presidents of the Association; two served as editors; two, as secretaries; and one, as treasurer. The first of the seventeen to die was "Charlie" Woolbert who left us in 1929 at the age of 52. The latest to go was "Jim" Winans, in 1956, at the age of 85. Of all those now deceased, the one to live the longest was Joseph Gaylord, who at the time of his death in 1956, was 96. Five of the seventeen—Lardner, Merry, O'Neill, Phelps, and Rarig—are still living.

These seventeen founding fathers watched over our cradle in the days when we were weak. They sacrificed time, energy, and money in our behalf and they induced others to do likewise. Not the least of their talents was their ability to recruit and inspire followers. Because of what they said and did, education in America acquired a new dimension.

In December 1915 we had a total of 156 members, our dues were $2.00, the convention fee was $1.00, 16 people appeared on the program, and the treasurer reported a deficit of $508.69 with loans from members amounting to $479.

In these days when thousands throng our convention halls and attempt to follow a ninety-page program of events, we are prone to fall into the delusion that all our progress has been automatic and inevitable. When we are tempted to take our heritage for granted, we well may ponder the poignant words of George Washington, spoken as he mourned the death of his soldiers slain in a pathetic little raid to secure corn for their starving comrades: "This liberty," he said, "will seem easy by and by when nobody has to die to get it."

The history of mankind bears eloquent testimony to the fact that a mere handful of men who are obedient to a great vision can shake the world. So it was with the seventeen. They were men of foresight and courage. They established a beach-head on a bleak and barren coast, and they held it and expanded it under the guns of the enemy. They were not of those who shrink back; they had what it took!

Time has thinned their ranks. In vain our eyes search the convention crowds for the once familiar faces, and our ears strain to catch the clear voices to which we were wont to listen in other days. It is good for us to pause now and then and commune with the spirits of those who have climbed aloft and with those few who are still with us in the flesh. As we draw upon their strength and wisdom, we assure ourselves that our past will be but prologue to the swelling theme of the future which now beckons us forward.

THE FORUM

EXCERPTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago
28-31 December, 1958

The Administrative Council was called to order by President Elise Hahn, who announced several changes in the agenda for the Administrative Council meetings.

Loren Reid announced the deaths of Joseph O'Brien and Howard Gilkinson during the year. The Council stood in silent tribute for one minute.

The floor was opened to discussion on whom the Council wished to appoint as its member of the Nominating Committee. Rousse nominated John Black. Braden moved that the nominations be closed. Auer seconded. Dietrich called for the question, and nominations were closed.

The report of the Nominating Committee for Editor of the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* nominating Richard Murphy for Editor from 1960-62 was received from Donald Bryant. The report was adopted.

The Report of the Nominating Committee for Editor of the *Speech Monographs* was received from Jeffery Auer. Douglas Ehninger was nominated for Editor for 1960-62. Black moved to close nominations. Reid seconded. Motion passed.

President Hahn announced that the Council had been asked to express an opinion on problems of interest groups. Dietrich opened the discussion by pointing out several problems faced by the groups. It was decided to introduce in the Legislative Assembly a resolution to appoint a standing advisory committee on Interest Groups, to include the Executive Secretary, and whose chairman would be advisor to the Interest Groups, with the function of providing advice and continuity to the interest groups.

The next item of business was a petition received from the New England Speech Association and introduced by Auer requesting recognition as a regional association. After discussion, Braden moved the acceptance of the petition. Robinson seconded. Oliver moved to postpone the vote and refer the petition to a joint discussion of the executive committees of the New England and Eastern States Speech Associations. Clark seconded. The motion to postpone passed.

Braden suggested that all reports of the present officers be accepted with gratitude. The reports of the officers and editors were accepted as written.

Executive Secretary Peterson presented his report and called to the attention of the Council the favorable surplus for 1957-58. Peterson moved that the SAA grant Emeritus Membership to Margaret Montague and C. M. Wise. Rousse seconded. Motion passed.

The next item of business was the consideration of the reports of the Advisory Committees. The Committee on Time and Place recommended the following sites and dates for future conventions: (1) Chicago in 1963 in December, (2) San Francisco or Los Angeles in 1964 in December. After discussion, Peterson suggested postponing further consideration of the report until the Monday meeting.

The Commitee on Publications' recommendation that the SAA provide a maximum of $25.00 each to Interest Groups for newsletters was referred to the Finance Committee.

Reid presented the report of the Committee on Committees. Braden moved acceptance of the report. Hance seconded. Passed. The report recommended a review of the structure and functions of the committees on Public Relations, Professional Ethics and Standards, Consultation, Publications, and Contemporary Public Address. Dietrich moved to refer the question of the need for a Committee on Public Relations to the Committee on Constitutional Revision with the recommendation that it consider the elimination of the committee. Hance seconded. Passed. The functions of the Committee on Consultation were discussed. It was suggested that the Committee on Contemporary Rhetoric and Public Address might become a part of the interest group on Rhetoric and Public Address rather than an actual committee.

The next item of business was a reconsideration of the report of the Committee on Time

and Place. The following communication was received from the Legislative Assembly:

> By a vote of 58 to 16 . . . "the Legislative Assembly recommends to the Committee on Time and Place that it seriously consider a plan for meeting between June 15 and September 1." . . . The Legislative Assembly also recommended that the Committee on Time and Place seriously consider 1) the possibility of holding the annual convention on a University campus, and 2) the desirability of meeting with the A.E.T.A. and the A.S.H.A.

Discussion followed. Murray submitted an invitation from the Denver Convention Bureau. Hahn pointed out that invitations had also been received from Minneapolis, Philadelphia, and Miami. The inadvisability of postponing the decision for another year was discussed. Oliver moved that the Council authorize and direct the holding of the 1963 convention in the month of August. Clark seconded. The motion passed. A preferential list of sites listed Denver, San Francisco, Minneapolis, and Chicago in that order. Rousse moved to postpone consideration of the decision until later, with the understanding that the Executive Secretary would investigate the places listed and report back to the group. Hance seconded. Passed.

The Report of the Committee on Assistance to Foreign Universities was presented by Bryan. Oliver recommended that the Council make a grant of $500 to the committee to provide for the sending of books. Hance moved to refer the recommendation to the Finance Committee. Rousse seconded. Passed.

President Hahn read the following communication from the Legislative Assembly: ". . . that the Legislative Assembly request the president of the Speech Association of America to appoint a person to serve in 1959 for one year on a temporary basis to advise the Interest Groups." She announced that she would like to appoint Wilbur Gilman to serve as the advisor, contingent on his agreement.

Auer presented the report of the Advisory Committees on Professional Ethics and Standards. Hance moved that the Executive Vice President be authorized to appoint an *ad hoc* committee for the purpose of drafting a code of professional ethics and standards to report to the total Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards. Seconded and passed.

Peterson reported regarding a time and place for the 1963 convention that the Denver Hilton could accommodate the SAA in August, 1963, and would provide facilities similar to those of Hilton in Chicago. Oliver moved to hold the 1963 convention in August in Denver. Fest seconded. The original motion was amended to instruct the Executive Secretary to select the week in August which provides least conflict between summer school dates and high school opening dates; and that, if there must be a conflict, that dates be chosen which will not conflict with the high schools. The motion as amended passed.

President Hahn asked for recommendations on the 1964 convention. Fest suggested postponing action until next year. Braden moved to table the motion. Dietrich seconded. Passed.

Wallace presented the Report of the Finance Committee and moved that the Council approve the revised budget for 1958-59 and the tentative budget for 1959-60. Rousse seconded. Passed.

The report of the Committee on Constitutional Revision was presented by Kramer. Hance announced that the Legislative Assembly had unanimously accepted all but one item. Kramer explained the reasons for the various amendments and moved acceptance of the report of the Committee. Auer seconded. Passed.

Hahn announced that Wilbur Gilman had accepted the post as advisor to interest groups.

Hahn read a request made by the Executive Committee of the Legislative Assembly; that it be recommended to the Council that if presently pending revisions of the constitution and the by-laws are approved the entire Constitution and By-Laws be republished. Rousse moved to request the editors of the *Speech Teacher* and the *Quarterly Journal* to print the revised Constitution and By-Laws at the earliest possible time. Auer seconded. Fest moved to amend so that the motion would read, "to request the editors and the Executive Secretary to consult as to the best way to print this so as to bring it to the attention of all members of the Association." Wallace seconded. Amendment passed. Motion passed.

The report of the Committee on Awards was received. Auer moved that the request of the committee to be discharged be accepted. Wallace seconded. Passed.

President Hahn read suggestions from the Executive Committee of the Assembly. (1) It had been moved that the Administrative Council be requested to authorize secretarial help

and duplicating equipment suitable for handling action reports and other business of the Assembly. Rousse moved that the request be submitted to the Executive Secretary. Auer seconded. Passed. (2) It had been moved that the Executive Committee recommend that the roster of the Executive Committee be printed in all communications in which lists of officers and committees are printed. Rousse moved to accept the request and submit it to the Executive Secretary. Auer seconded. Passed.

Dr. C. R. Van Dusen invited the SAA to Miami for a future convention. Rousse suggested that Van Dusen be commended for his invitation and presentation.

The meeting was adjourned.

BUSINESS MEETING

Sunday, December 28—2:00-2:30 p. m.

Kenneth Hance called the joint meeting of the Legislative Assembly and the Administrative Council to order and turned the meeting over to President Hahn. She introduced Karl Wallace, Chairman of the Finance Committee, who presented the Committee report. Peterson answered several questions from the floor concerning the report.

Wallace commended the work of the Executive Secretary on behalf of the Finance Committee. Hahn turned the meeting back over to Hance, who adjourned the joint meeting.

BUSINESS MEETING

Wednesday, December 31—1:00 p. m.

President Hahn opened the meeting at 1:15.

Hance moved that the SAA express its appreciation to Wayne Thompson for his outstanding work as Clerk of the Legislative Assembly for three years and for his willingness to serve as clerk for another three years. Dietrich seconded. Passed.

Dietrich moved that the SAA express its gratitude to the various members of the local coordinating and arrangements committees. Seconded and passed.

The next item of business was the installation of new officers. President Hahn spoke of her gratitude for the three years of service as an officer. She then passed the gavel to John Dietrich, the new President. He expressed his personal appreciation to Hahn and introduced the new officers.

President Dietrich then called for new business. Brigance asked permission of the SAA to find money to bring out another printing of the volumes of *History and Criticism of American Public Address*. Braden moved that Brigance be authorized to attempt to raise money for this project with the gratitude and thanks of the Association. Hahn seconded. Passed.

Cortright moved to vote special gratitude and thanks for the splendid job as President of Elise Hahn. Hance seconded. Passed.

Carl Pitt raised the question of whether, in view of the fact that at the last session of Congress legislation was passed for the carrying out of certain studies in science and language, the SAA should make an attempt to have speech involved in any further such legislation. Bryant moved that the attention of the Executive Vice-President be called to this matter. Brigance seconded. Passed.

Braden moved adjournment. Wallace seconded. Passed at 1:30.

BUDGETS SUBMITTED BY FINANCE COMMITTEE AND APPROVED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AT THE 1958 CONVENTION

	Revised Budget '58-'59	Tentative Budget '59-'60
Publications:		
QJS	$13,000.00	$14,000.00
Speech Monographs	5,200.00	5,400.00
Speech Teacher	7,500.00	8,000.00
Annual *Directory*	4,000.00	4,500.00
Special Printing	850.00	900.00
Purchase of Old Copies	500.00	500.00
Printing and Mimeographing:		
Stationery	750.00	750.00
New Solicitations	1,000.00	1,000.00
Renewals	500.00	500.00
Placement	500.00	500.00
Convention	3,000.00	3,000.00
Personnel:		
Officers and Committees	1,750.00	2,000.00
Secretary and Clerical	18,500.00	20,000.00
Dues and Fees:		
American Council on Education	200.00	200.00
AETA Share of Convention Fee	500.00	350.00
Commissions and Discounts	2,500.00	2,750.00
Bank Charges	100.00	100.00
Secretary's Bond and Audit	365.00	365.00
Other Expenses:		
Postage and Distribution	3,000.00	3,300.00
Binding	650.00	700.00
Telephone and Telegraph	300.00	300.00
Insurance	150.00	150.00
Convention Expense	3,500.00	3,500.00
Depreciation	1,200.00	1,200.00
Provision for Doubtful Accounts	500.00	500.00

Office Supplies and Service	1,850.00	2,000.00
Reserve Fund for Perm. Headquarters	3,000.00	3,000.00
TOTAL EXPENSES	$74,865.00	$79,465.00
REPLACEMENT OF OLD AND PURCHASE OF NEW EQUIPMENT	$ 800.00	$ 800.00
PURCHASE CAR LOAD OF PAPER	5,200.00	

EXCERPTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

The Second Vice-President, Kenneth Hance, called the meeting to order at 11:05.

The speaker stated that the Executive Committee had recommended Paul Carmack as Parliamentarian. There were no nominations from the floor. Gilman moved that nominations be closed and that the Clerk be instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for Carmack. Seconded. Passed.

The Assembly, upon the suggestion of the Speaker, rose in silent tribute to the memories of Joseph O'Brien and Howard Gilkinson.

The minutes as summarized in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and *Speech Teacher* were declared approved.

The Executive Vice-President reported that the New England Speech Association had requested recognition. Bohman moved that the Legislative Assembly recognize the New England Speech Association as regional association. Oliver moved that action be postponed for one year. Seconded. The motion to postpone was lost 35-30. Penn moved that the main motion be referred to a committee of five to be appointed by the Speaker and that the committee report at the 1959 convention. Seconded. The motion to commit was carried 47-12.

Cortright asked the Executive Vice-President what action was being taken concerning the proposed change in North Central certification requirements. Erickson moved that the issue be taken up by the Legislative Assembly. Seconded. Passed. Arnold moved that the Speaker appoint a committee to draft a resolution to present to the Legislative Assembly. Seconded. Passed. The Speaker appointed Wynett Barnett and Marceline Erickson to serve with Rupert Cortright (chairman) on the committee.

Wofford Gardner as chairman reported for the Resolutions Committee.

Action Report A recommending that the Consultation Committee investigate the possibility of including a section in speech on the National Teacher Examinations and also investigate the present status of speech in the Graduate Record Examination was approved by the Assembly.

The Assembly approved Action Report B which recommended to the Committee on Time and Place that it seriously consider a plan for meeting in alternative years between June 15 and September 1 on a university campus. The Assembly also recommended that the Committee on Time and Place consider the desirability of meeting with the AETA and ASHA.

Approval was given to Action Report C recommending to the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards the desirability of drafting a code of ethics and standards for the Speech Association of America.

Action Report D recommending to the Administrative Council the request that no official mail ballot of the Association require the signature of the member, and that instead each return envelope have a line for a signature on the outside with the understanding that the signature would be checked without reference to the ballot in the envelope.

Action Report E was not reported out by the Committee on Resolutions.

The Assembly approved Action Report F which recommended that the Interest Groups adopt the policy that abstracts or outlines of papers and speeches to be presented to the committee should be submitted to sectional chairmen one month in advance of the convention.

The Assembly further approved Action Report G which requested the Executive Secretary to inform, by the most appropriate means, all members of the Association concerning the resolution of the Legislative Assembly which "endorses the principle that members of the Association should, whenever possible, limit themselves to the presentation of a single paper during the programs of a convention."

No action was taken on Action Report K.

Auer reported that the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards recommended that the Legislative Assembly not endorse any of the items in Action Report L. The Assembly voted to uphold the position of the Committee.

The Chairman of the Tellers Committee reported that the Nominating Committee of the Legislative Assembly for 1959 will be Carroll Arnold (chairman), Wayne Eubank, Claude Kantner, Upton Palmer, and David Potter.

The Speaker announced the appointment of the following committees to consider the advisability of granting recognition to the New England Speech Association as a regional association. George Bohman (chairman), Wayne Eubank, Mary Louise Gehring, Magdalene Kramer, and Wofford Gardner.

The Legislative Assembly approved Action Report H which recommended to the Administrative Council that the editors of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and *The Speech Teacher* provide for the Executive Secretary a special section of each issue of the journals which would be reserved especially for, and limited to, the publication of amendments, minutes of meetings, reports of Association committees, notices, and other official business of the Association.

The Assembly approved Action Report I granting Emeritus Membership to Margaret Montague and Claude M. Wise.

The Legislative Assembly approved Action Report J which recommended that the Executive Vice-President consult with the Interest Group in Speech in the Secondary Schools and with the appointed officers of A.E.T.A. concerning the resolution of the Western Speech Association regarding the status of required courses in speech in the secondary schools.

Magdalene Kramer reported for the Committee on the Revision of the Constitution. Oliver moved that the Legislative Assembly approve the changes in the constitution and the by-laws as submitted by Kramer. Arnold moved to amend the motion by excepting from the motion to approve the revision pertaining to Article IX, section 8, line 18. Seconded. Passed. The motion as amended was passed.

James McBath, chairman, reported for the Tellers Committee. The elected candidates were as follows:

For the representative to serve on the SAA Nominating Committee: William Howell.

For representatives to serve on the SAA Committee on Committees: P. Merville Larson, Gladys Borchers, Rupert Cortright.

For representatives of interest groups on the Executive Committee: Giles Gray, George V. Bohman.

For representatives of geographical areas on the Executive Committee: Eastern: Carroll Arnold; Central: Charles Balcer; Southern: Mary Louise Gehring; Western: William McCoard.

Rupert Cortright, as chairman of the Special Committee on Certification Requirements of the North Central Association, made the following motion: "This Assembly urges and authorizes its Speaker to appoint a committee, including the ablest and most broadly representative professional personnel available, to study the proposals of the North Central Association for teacher certification in speech; and this Assembly further authorizes said committee: (1) to take all action necessary to gain the support of other educational groups, and (2) to work with the North Central Association in achieving our mutual goals in speech education through reasonable and fair standards of teacher certification." Seconded. Passed.

Kramer recommended that no action be taken on the constitutional revision pertaining to article IX, section 6, line 18.

Cowperthwaite made the following motion: "To add a new standing committee, to be known as the Interest Group Advisory Committee. This Committee shall be composed of a chairman, the Executive Secretary of SAA, and three members representing three different interest groups, the committee membership to be nominated by the Committee on Committees and confirmed by the Legislative Assembly. It shall act in an advisory capacity to interest groups on matters pertaining to interest group organization, standard operating procedures, and shall serve as a liaison between and among interest groups." The motion was seconded. Palmer moved to amend by substituting the following motion: "Be it resolved by the Legislative Assembly that the appropriate section of the SAA Constitution be amended so that the Committee on Committees shall name a person to be known as the Interest Group advisor. This person shall act in an advisory capacity to interest groups on matters pertaining to interest group organization and standard operating procedures, and shall serve as a liaison between and among interest groups." Seconded. Cromwell moved to insert the phrase "for a period of three years" after "name a person." Seconded. Passed. The substitute motion was passed. The main motion as amended was passed.

Bohman moved that the Legislative Assembly request the President of S.A.A. to appoint a person to serve in 1959 for one year on a temporary basis to advise the interest groups. Seconded. Passed.

Cortright moved that the meeting adjourn. Seconded. Passed.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Amend Article VI, Section 1. Line 13, regarding the duties of the President of the Speech Association of America, by inserting after the phrase "during his term of office;" the following: "in the event of the disability, death, or resignation of the Executive Vice-President, the Executive Secretary, or the Editor of any of the publications, he [the President] shall appoint a special nominating committee to name a member to fill the unexpired term, the nomination to be approved by the Administrative Council by mail ballot;"

Amend Article VIII, Section 3. Line 28, concerning the duties of the Administrative Council, by deleting the phrase "shall consider liaison activities for the Association" and inserting "shall consider liaison problems relative to the administration of the Association."

Amend Article VIII, Section 4. Line 8, by inserting after the phrase "its decisions" the following: "between annual meetings." The effect of this addition is to make clear that the only decisions subject to revision by a two-thirds vote of the members of the Legislative Assembly present at any annual meeting of the Association are those decisions made between annual meetings.

Amend Article IX, Section 2. Line 7, by deleting the word "report" and inserting the word "reports"; deleting the semicolon after "Finance Committee," and inserting the following: "and of the Committee of Time and Place;" so that this line will read: "[The Legislative Assembly] . . . shall meet jointly with the Administrative Council to receive and consider the report of the Finance Committee and the Committee on Time and Place."

Amend Article IX, Line 19, concerning the duties of the Legislative Assembly, by inserting after the word "Committees;" the following: "shall receive the reports of the Committee on Public Relations and of the Project Committees;"

Amend Article IX, Section 3, to read as follows: "The standing committees of the Legislative Assembly shall be the Committee on Credentials, the Committee on Resolutions, and the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Credentials shall be composed of a chairman and four other members of the Legislative Assembly, to be nominated by the Committee on Committees and confirmed by the Legislative Assembly. The Committee on Credentials shall receive from the Executive Secretary the list of official delegates and shall certify these delegates by issuing official badges entitling them to the floor of the Assembly. The Committee on Resolutions shall be composed of a chairman and four other members of the Legislative Assembly, to be nominated by the Committee on Committees and confirmed by the Legislative Assembly. The Committee on Resolutions shall draft resolutions and, with the concurrence of the Executive Committee, shall present resolutions to the Legislative Assembly. It shall receive for consideration and possible presentation as resolutions to the Assembly proposals from individual members and/or groups in the Association, or by referral, proposals from the Legislative Assembly, from the Executive Committee of the Legislative Assembly, from the Interest Groups, from Committees of the Association, and/or from the Administrative Council. The Committee on Rules shall be composed of the Parliamentarian as Chairman, the Speaker, the Clerk, and two other members of the Executive Committee appointed by the Speaker. It shall formulate and recommend to the Assembly procedures which relate to such matters as definitions of functions and methods of keeping actions in harmony with the letter and intent of the Constitution and By-Laws."

Amend Article IX, Section 4, by deleting Section 4 and inserting the following: "The Legislative Assembly shall meet at the time and place of the annual meeting of the Association, and shall hold its major sessions prior to the convention program."

Amend Article IX, Section 6, lines 18 to 28, concerning the duties of the Executive Committee of the Legislative Assembly to read as follows: "The Executive Committee shall prepare the agenda for the annual meeting of the Assembly; shall review and approve, amend, or disapprove the resolutions drafted by the Committee on Resolutions; shall carry out the instructions of the Assembly; shall nominate the Parliamentarian of the Assembly; shall report the actions of the Assembly to the Administrative Council; shall act upon proposals in Interest Groups concerning projects, services, questionnaires, and meetings between conventions; and shall fill vacancies on Assembly Committees when they occur."

Amend Article X, Section 8, to read: "Each Interest Group shall elect one member to serve as a delegate in the Legislative Assembly and one member to serve on the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards. The delegate

shall represent the Group in the deliberations of the Assembly and shall report to the Group actions by the Assembly affecting the Group. The member of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards shall represent the Group in the deliberations of the Committee and shall report annually to the Group."

Amend Article X by adding, after Section 11, Section 12. "Interest Groups may establish, for the Administration of their activities, by-laws consistent with the Constitution and the By-Laws of the Association. The by-laws should be submitted to the Administrative Council and filed with the Executive Secretary."

Amend Article XI, Section 2, lines 10 and 11 by deleting the phrase "the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards." The effect of this amendment is to remove the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards from the list of committees whose members are appointed by the Committee on Committees.

Amend Article XI, Section 7, regarding the Committee on Public Relations, by inserting at the end of the section the following: "The Committee shall report both to the Administrative Council and to the Legislative Assembly."

Amend Article XI, Section 8, concerning the Committee on Time and Place, by inserting at the end of the section "The Committee shall inform the Legislative Assembly of its recommendations."

Amend Article XI, Section 9, to read as follows: "Project Committees, authorized by the Administrative Council, shall undertake special projects and shall report annually to the Administrative Council, and to the Legislative Assembly. The chairmen of the Committees shall be designated by the Committee on Committees."

Amend Article XII by substituting for the present Section 2 the following: "All proposed amendments shall be submitted to the Committee on Resolutions to be transmitted without recommendation to the Legislative Assembly for consideration," and by changing the number of the present Section 2 to "Section 3," and by changing the number of the present Section 3 to "Section 4."

Amend Article XIII by deleting Article XIII in its entirety.

These amendments were passed by the Legislative Assembly and the Administrative Council at their meetings in Chicago, December 1958. Final action on the proposed amendments will be submitted to the membership by means of a printed ballot. The following amendments to the Constitution have been proposed in petition signed by more than 25 members of the Speech Association of America.

Amend Article X, Section 13 as follows: "An advisor to Interest Groups shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees for a term of three years. He shall act in an advisory capacity to Interest Groups in matters pertaining to organization and standard operating procedures and shall serve as a liaison between and among Interest Groups. He shall report to the Executive Secretary and to the Legislative Assembly."

Amend Article XI, Section 2, to add the following sentence: "The Committee shall recommend to the Administrative Council and to the Legislative Assembly a nominee for Advisor to Interest Groups."

Amend Article X, Section 6, line 3, to delete the period and to add the following: "and shall keep the Advisor to Interest Groups informed concerning the activities of the Interest Group."

Amendments to the By-Laws

Amend Article III by inserting the word "Association" before the phrase "Nominating Committee," in Section 2, Line 5 and Section 3, Lines 1, 12, 38, 43, 49, 56, 64, and 98.

Amend Article III, Section 3, paragraph 9, to read as follows: "The Chairman of the Committee shall check with the Executive Secretary on the status of the membership of all nominees. In cooperation with the Executive Secretary he shall determine the willingness of each nominee to serve. The report of the Committee shall be published in the second issue of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and of *The Speech Teacher* following the election of the Committee."

Amend Article III, Section 4, to read as follows: "Any twenty-five members of the Association may make additional nominations by submitting them to the Executive Secretary not later than thirty days after the publication of the report of the Association Nominating Committee. These nominations shall be published in the next issue of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and of *The Speech Teacher*."

Amend Article III by inserting as a new Section 5 the following: "The Assembly Nominating Committee shall consist of five members of the Assembly in attendance at the convention, each from a different institution, and the five representing the four geographical areas. A per-

son who has served on the Assembly Nominating Committee during the previous two years shall be ineligible to serve on the Committee. The Assembly Nominating Committee shall be elected by preferential ballot. At the first meeting of the Assembly at the convention preceding the one in which the Committee positions to be filled fall vacant, the Nominating Committee shall nominate candidates for Committee posts which the Assembly is authorized to fill by election. Each member of the Assembly shall be entitled to cast a ballot on which he lists the names of five eligible candidates for the Nominating Committee. The one member of the Association Nominating Committee to be elected by the Legislative Assembly shall be elected by preferential ballot in the Assembly. The member elected shall be ineligible to serve on the Assembly Nominating Committee," and by changing the number of the present Section 5 to "Section 6," the number of the present Section 6 to "Section 7," the number of the present Section 7 to "Section 8," the number of the present Section 8 to "Section 9," and the number of the present Section 9 to "Section 10."

Amend Article III by adding a new Section 11 as follows: "If an editor of any one of the official publications of the Association should die or become disabled before he has completed two years of service, a new editor shall be elected to complete the original three-year term. If an editor should die or become disabled after he has served two years or longer, then the editor-elect shall be asked to assume the editorship for the balance of the deceased or the disabled editor's term as well as for his own three-year term."

Amend Article IV by deleting the present Section 5 and inserting the following: "Section 5. A delegate to the Assembly elected from a geographical area shall complete his term in the Assembly even though he changes his geographical area of residence before the expiration of his term."

Amend Article V, Section 5, to read as follows: "At each annual meeting five members of the Interest Group shall be elected to serve as the Nominating Committee of the Interest Group for the following year. No more than one member of the Committee shall be chosen from any state or territory. No member shall be eligible to succeed himself. The Committee shall nominate two candidates for Vice-Chairman, two candidates for Secretary, two candidates for the new member of the Advisory Committee, two candidates for the delegate to the Legislative Assembly, and two candidates for the representative on the Committee on Ethics and Standards. The Secretary of the Interest Group shall report the results of the election to the Executive Secretary of the Association."

COMMITTEES FOR 1959

The name of the chairman of the Committee appears first.

Nominating Committee

Nominating Committee: Donald Bryant, John Black, John Dietrich, H. Clay Harshbarger, William Howell.

Advisory Committees

Committee on Committees: Elise Hahn, J. Jeffery Auer, Gladys Borchers, Donald C. Bryant, Rupert Cortright, John Dietrich, John Black, Kenneth Hance, P. Merville Larson, Karl Robinson, Owen Peterson, Ralph Nichols.

Finance: Karl Wallace (chairman until June 30), Waldo Braden (chairman after July 1), Kenneth G. Hance, Owen Peterson, J. Jeffery Auer (effective July 1).

Publications: T. Earle Johnson (1 yr.), Leland Griffin (2 yrs.), Donald C. Bryant, Karl Robinson, John Black, Owen Peterson, Samuel Becker (3 yrs.).

Time and Place: Magdalene Kramer (1 yr.), Wayne Thompson (2 yrs.), Elise Hahn (3 yrs.), Owen Peterson.

Public Relations: John Wright (1 yr.), Robert Haakenson (2 yrs.), J. Jeffery Auer, John Dietrich, Owen Peterson.

Consultation: Karl Wallace, Thomas Rousse, Lester Thonssen, Loren Reid, Elise Hahn, J. Jeffery Auer, Owen Peterson.

Professional Ethics and Standards: J. Jeffery Auer and one member to be named by each Interest Group.

Coordinating Committees

Committee on Cooperation between SAA and Related Organizations: John Dietrich, and presidents of AETA, AFA, ASHA, and NSSC.

Committee on Cooperation between SAA and Regional Associations: J. Jeffery Auer and the presidents of CSSA, WSA, SSA, SAES, and PSA.

Service Committees

Contemporary Public Address: Robert C. Jeffrey, John W. Bachman, A. Craig Baird, Milton Dickens, Frederick W. Haberman, Harold F. Harding, N. Edd Miller, Gordon I. Thomas,

Ralph Richardson, Eugene E. White, Thomas F. Daly. (Consultant, *Vital Speeches of the Day*).

International Discussion and Debate: Franklin R. Shirley, Wayne E. Eubank, Mary Louise Gehring, Martin J. Holcomb, James H. McBath, Robert P. Newman, Brooks Quimby. (Consultant from the Institute on International Education).

Committee on Archives: L. LeRoy Cowperthwaite, A. Craig Baird, Paul Boase, Giles Wilkeson Gray, Owen Peterson, Earl Wiley.

Committee on Recruitment and Supply: Leroy T. Laase, Elton Abernathy, Fred Alexander, Marceline Erickson, Evelyn Konigsberg, George Lewis, Virginia Miller, Wanda B. Mitchell, Waldo Phelps, David C. Phillips, Loren Reid, Hugh Seabury.

Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate: Winston L. Brembeck will be the SAA representative until January 1, 1961. The other members of the committee are representatives of AFA, DSR, PKD, PRP, TKA.

Study Committees

Problems in Graduate Study: H. P. Constans, Wallace A. Bacon, Oscar G. Brockett, Marie Hochmuth, Claude E. Kantner, Franklin H. Knower, Charles W. Lomas, Wilbert Pronovost.

Problems in Teaching Speech in the Armed Forces: Joseph H. Mahaffey, George F. Batka, Francis Cartier, Clair R. Henderlider, James H. McBath, Eugene S. Myers, Warren C. Thompson.

Project Committees

Committee on Biographical Dictionary of Speech Education: Giles W. Gray, Edyth Renshaw, Douglas Ehninger.

Volume of Studies of Public Address on the Issue of Anti-Slavery and Disunion, circa 1860: J. Jeffery Auer, A. Craig Baird, Henry L. Ewbank, Sr.

Volume of Studies in the Colonial Period of American Public Address: George V. Bohman, Orville Hitchcock, Ernest J. Wrage.

Volume of Studies in Southern Oratory: Waldo Braden, J. Jeffery Auer, Lindsey S. Perkins.

Volume of Studies of the Speaking of the Age of the Great Revolt, 1870-1898: Lindsey S. Perkins, Robert G. Gunderson, Hollis L. White.

Ad Hoc Committees

Assistance to Foreign Universities: Martin Bryan, Laura Crowell, Leslie R. Kreps, Sumner Ives, Robert T. Oliver, C. M. Wise.

Constitutional Revision: Magdalene Kramer, Carroll C. Arnold, John Dietrich, Wilbur E. Gilman, Lester Thonssen.

Committees of the Legislative Assembly

Credentials: William Sattler, Virginia Miller, Mardell Ogilvie, Charles Redding, John Wilson.

Resolutions: Martin Andersen, Albert Croft, Wofford Gardner, Elbert Harrington, Wilbur Moore, Edgar Willis.

Executive Committee: Johnnye Akin, Carroll C. Arnold, Charles Balcer, Donald E. Bird, George V. Bohman, Wayne C. Eubanks, Mary Louise Gehring, Giles W. Gray, Frederick Haberman, Paul D. Holtzman, Kenneth O. Johnson, Claude Kantner, Lawrence Kasdon, Robert Kully, William McCoard, H. Hardy Perritt, David Phillips, Claude Shaver, Donald K. Smith, Wayne N. Thompson, Margaret Wood.

REPORT ON ELECTION OF THE 1959 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

On the first ballot for the 1959 Nominating Committee, a total of 645 ballots were received with 274 different persons receiving votes. The twelve receiving the most votes were: Elton Abernathy, Donald C. Bryant, Milton Dickens, Wilbur F. Gilman, Robert G. Gunderson, H. Clay Harshbarger, William S. Howell, Richard Murphy, Robert T. Oliver, Claude L. Shaver, Ernest J. Wrage, W. Hayes Yeager.

On the second ballot, 1090 valid votes were cast for the twelve candidates. In tabulating the votes by the Hare system of proportional representation, the following three persons were selected for the 1959 Nominating Committee:

Donald C. Bryant, *State University of Iowa*
H. Clay Harshbarger, *State University of Iowa*
Robert T. Oliver, *Pennsylvania State University*

At the 1958 Convention, the Administrative Council selected John Black, Ohio State University, and the Legislative Assembly selected William Howell, University of Minnesota, as the other two members of the committee.

GREY FLANNEL MOUTH ONCE MORE

To the Editor:

The article by Hugo Hellman, "The Man With the Grey Flannel Mouth," in the February 1958 *QJS*, has stirred up

considerable interest, if not controversy, among teachers of discussion. In this connection, I was pleased to see the letter to the editor by Franklyn Haiman, under the title, "Haiman to Hellman," in the Forum of the April 1958 *QJS*.

You may also know that Mr. Hellman joined with another writer, Lynn Surles, to write a similar article titled, "The Grey Flannel Mouth," which appeared in the August 1958 issue of the *Journal of the American Society of Training Directors*. I have written a reply in which I discuss both Hellman articles, under the title, "The Discussion Process in Industrial Training—Some Misconceptions about the Grey Flannel Mouth," which appeared in the January 1959 issue of the *JASTD*.

Since many readers of *QJS* are interested in this subject, and because the *Journal* may not ordinarily come to their attention, I am writing you to suggest that this letter be included in the Forum.

HAROLD P. ZELKO
The Pennsylvania State University

ZETA PHI ETA AWARD CHILDREN'S THEATRE CONFERENCE

To the Editor:

In honor of Winifred Ward's achievement in creative dramatics for children, and in recognition of the contribution of new producing groups to Children's Theatre, the Zeta Phi Eta Award is given annually to an institutional, community, or professional group which produces an annual season of live plays for child audiences.

Recommendations submitted by members of CTC or applications from the qualifying groups themselves submitted by July 1 will be reviewed at the annual CTC meeting by the Awards Committee. From three names submitted by the committee, the Governing Board will select the winner of the citation and the prize of $50.00.

Information concerning applications may be obtained from Mr. Vern Adix, 1532 Michigan Ave., Salt Lake City 5, Utah.

MRS. HAROLD R. DINGES
Children's Theatre Conference

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ROBERT G. GUNDERSON, *Editor*

TENSION AND TRAGEDY

Hubert C. Heffner

In her *Eugene O'Neill and the Tragic Tension* Doris V. Falk, with the aid of the Neo-Freudians, especially Karen Horney and Erich Fromm, has written a mature and penetrating study of what she aptly calls the tragic tension within the O'Neill characters. In play after play she finds O'Neill probing a psychological disunity in modern man which amounts to a spiritual disease. The major characters of O'Neill's plays are obsessed with pride, not "that healthy self-respecting pride which gives men confidence to act; it is instead the false pride that Nietzsche calls 'vanity'—the attempt to create oneself according to an impossible, untrue self-image. The sick and swollen ego cannot differentiate between humility and humiliation, and therefore cannot face the reality of its falseness without complete destruction. The victim of this neurotic pride, like the classic tragic hero, has unconsciously rejected his humanity—his real, imperfect self—for aspiration to Godlike perfection. His desperate, unconscious urge to achieve this divinity may drive him forward with the compulsive monomania of a Napoleon or a Hitler; the shame of his inevitable failure to achieve it may cause him wilfully to punish or destroy himself, or to seek asylum from the struggle in apathy or death."

Mr. Heffner (M.A. North Carolina, 1922) is Professor of Speech and Theatre at Indiana University and former Editor of Educational Theatre Journal.

This conception of the O'Neill character is set forth in the first chapter. Her second chapter is devoted to stating the questions which, she contends, actually lie behind the writing of all of O'Neill's plays: "What *is* the symbolism with which men celebrate life? What is the nature of the 'struggle to exist as masks among the masks of the living?' " She holds, further, that not until he came to write his later plays—*The Iceman Cometh, A Moon for the Misbegotten,* and *Long Day's Journey Into Night*—did O'Neill reveal to himself and to his audience the "anguished need" that compelled him to ask these questions and search for answers to them. In her third chapter, entitled "The Searchers," dealing with the chief roles in *The Hairy Ape, Beyond the Horizon, The Straw,* and *Anna Christie (Chris Christopherson),* Falk says that in the characters of these plays O'Neill is presenting the positive searchers after selfhood. Most of them have experienced an alienation of self. Some of them undergo unbearable tensions between their glorified self, their despised self, and their true self. Certain characters resolve their tensions by identifying with their ideal self—the "expansive solutions," as Horney calls it—becoming "arrogant, vindictive, tyrannical . . . acknowledging no equal nor superior"; others identify with their despicable self, becoming abject and submissive; yet others resign altogether from the conflict, picturing themselves

"as . . . impassive observers invulnerable to human emotions." In the fourth chapter she presents "The Extremists" —characters from *Gold, The Emperor Jones,* and *Different*—"who, like the searchers, are aliens from self; but they are not bewildered." They attempt to subject all demands to their own egotistical illusions, creating tragedy for themselves and those near them. Curtis Jayson in *The First Man* likewise belongs to this group. Though the extremists "achieve a kind of union with the aggressive mask," theirs is no more real nor final answer to their problem than is that of the searchers. In the fifth chapter, "The Finders," dealing with the characters of *The Fountain, Welded, All God's Chillun Got Wings, Marco Millions, Desire Under the Elms, The Great God Brown,* and *Lazarus Laughed,* she contends that, in these plays, O'Neill is concerned with man discovering himself, what Horney calls self-realization. "The road to the discovery of the real self must lead first to a tearing down of the illusions about the self." "The finders cannot settle for the extremist's mad fulfillment of the ego, or for the searcher's bewilderment, evasion, or escape 'beyond the horizon.'" Pride is again the sin of the finders and they are well aware that it is. They also know that pride is indispensable to them. "They must accept both the pride and humility of being man, artist, or lover, with faith in the dependence of life upon the tragic fact that there can never be perfection, nor even a perfect balance between the opposites, but there must always be a tension which pulls us toward one, only to pull toward the other. This is the torment which man is driven to celebrate in all his symbol-making arts—but most literally and specifically in tragedy." But, as she indicates later: "In these plays the characters find only a new pseudosolution; they do not discover the real self beneath the conflicting masks; they only discover the masks, which they mistakenly think constitute the totality of self." In the sixth chapter, "The Trapped"—dealing with the characters of *Strange Interlude, Dynamo,* and *Mourning Becomes Electra*—she argues that the pride which traps the protagonist wears the mask of the father. "The characters long to escape him and to find the mother, the Cybele of love and free acceptance, but she is theirs only briefly, if at all, and father claims them for his own at last." These characters, too, suffer from neurotic pride, which is not the "Righteous pride of one who sacrifices his life for a noble cause." Yet, she argues, in O'Neill's characters neurotic pride "follows still the blinding, destructive pattern of *hubris.*" "For the neurotic, self-knowledge may reveal the subconscious self-hatred which generated the illusory self-image in the first place; then on a conscious level the hatred can be satisfied, the self can be punished and finally accepted; justice can be accomplished and the protagonist can find peace at last." It may be the peace of "all passion spent," as with Nina; or of self imprisonment, as with Lavinia; or the peace of death, as with Reuben Light. In the seventh relatively brief chapter, "The Way Out," with a brief glance at *Ah, Wilderness!*, Falk discusses *Days Without End* as O'Neill's version of the Faust legend. In this play the cessation of strife between the two selfs is a return to faith, which constitutes a withdrawal from life. But in his subsequent work O'Neill reverted to the conception that: "Belief in the supernatural was an illusion, a 'pipe dream' to keep man alive when other values were gone." In the eighth chapter, entitled "Fatal Balance," the author discusses *The Iceman*

Cometh, A Touch of the Poet, and *Moon for the Misbegotten.* In these later plays, and especially in *Iceman,* O'Neill sees man, not as the hero of the tragic life struggle, but as a man who has proved himself a coward and an idiot, "clinging for life to the very delusions which had unmanned him." Though such a protagonist may be an object of disgust, he is pitiful. These plays represent characters who have disintegrated within their masks, for whom there is no hope but oblivion. They cling merely to a "hopeless hope." The ninth and last chapter deals solely with *Long Day's Journey Into Night.* This play she says is a tragedy with four heroes, protagonists who are partly responsible for their own destruction and partly victims of the family fate. Thus she uses this play to assert that O'Neill in his psychological probing of the nature of modern man caught in the "sickness of today" has attempted to write modern tragedy. "But his urge to shout the universality of a struggle whose very essence is its inwardness," "his eagerness to make some of his dramas tragic, rather than merely 'pessimistic,'" and his frequent attempt to "explain the inexplicable, to bring home to the audience the meaning of tragic affirmation" have sometimes vitiated his artistic accomplishment.

In using the psychology of the Neo-Freudians, and especially the system of Karen Horney, to illuminate O'Neill's characters and to expose something of the nature of their tragic dilemmas, Falk is not contending that O'Neill himself consciously based his depictions on any of these systems. She merely holds that "the work of the Neo-Freudians, whether or not theirs is the most effective school of modern psychology, both reflects and illuminates the patterns of human behavior which O'Neill described from his own observation and experience." Moreover, she is well aware that there is more to the making of tragedy than merely the psychology of the protagonist. She could not be a student of the late Henry Alonzo Myers, to whom she pays tribute in her "Acknowledgements," without this awareness. Consequently, though she never violates the unity of her investigation, she is constantly throwing light on other aspects of O'Neill's tragic drama, especially on the nature of the total tragic action—the plot. This book, then, is not, and is not meant to be, a complete study of O'Neill's tragedy; it is, rather, a limited study of one aspect, O'Neill's conception of the tragic nature of modern man. As such, it is a valuable study and a well-written book.

BOOK REVIEWED

EUGENE O'NEILL AND THE TRAGIC TENSION. By Doris V. Falk. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1958; pp. iii+211. $4.50.

* * *

THE ABBEY THEATRE. By Gerard Fay. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. 190. $4.50.

Anyone who undertakes the story of the Abbey Theatre's years of glory becomes the historian of a battle. Moreover, if he has a spark of humanity in him, he becomes a partisan historian. For the Abbey's battle was waged on a dozen fronts simultaneously, each participant claiming the outcome as a personal victory. Objectivity would be sheer affectation.

Gerard Fay takes a properly partisan perspective in his *Abbey Theatre.* As the son of Frank Fay his allegiance is natural and unstrained. The story he tells of the early years of the Irish theatre movement places Frank and Willie Fay squarely at the center where, of course, they belong; but he does not confuse the tale by telling it from their point of view. The partisanship is not defensive. His book, to be sure, begins with the idea of an Irish national theatre in Frank Fay's mind and ends with the Fays' departure from the Abbey. Yet there is no taint of special pleading, only an accenting that adds a fresh dimension to the old incidents and crises.

We learn, for example, how strong was Frank Fay's influence on Yeats, not only in the matter of forming a national theatre, but also as an educator of Yeats in the practices and history of the theatre. Gerard Fay writes:

> Frank Fay worked away at Yeats as though he were preparing him for an examination. He never moved far from the question of the relationship between the actor and the poet and of what the poet should demand of the actor in declamation, elocution or just plain speech.

And again:

> On any theatrical subject the Fays spoke to Yeats as an equal, that is after he had studied sufficiently to catch up with what they had learned while he had been deep in theosophy and the Order of the Golden Dawn.

Still Yeats fares well in these pages. If there is a villain it is Miss Hornimann whose antagonism to Willie Fay's management of the Abbey is reason enough for Gerard Fay's unsympathetic picture of her. Yet in this, as elsewhere, we never quite grasp what it is that is wrong or who exactly is at fault. The author is the London editor of *The Manchester Guardian*, who possesses the newspaperman's gift for loading. He rarely editorializes; he selects and arranges in a way that shapes attitudes without the reader's ever having the privilege of the facts.

The book is therefore not for beginners. The facts were better in hand before safely making a path among the snatches of correspondence, fragments of reviews, and newspaper articles that weave the fabric of Mr. Fay's recounting. Even the initiate may have the eerie sense of overhearing a conversation on an unfamiliar topic; the references are readily understood but the referent doesn't show up.

Nonetheless, an impression of fairness persists. We may suspect Mr. Fay's interpretation of Willie Fay's five-point proposal, the rejection of which by the Abbey management spurred the Fays' departure, but he is not guilty of suppressing the opposing interpretation. Actually, he gives it more space.

EDWIN BURR PETTET
Brandeis University

A PRIMER FOR PLAYGOERS. By Edward A. Wright. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1958; pp. xiii+270 with 32 pages of photographs. Trade $6.50, text $4.90.

Here is a book designed not for the makers of theatre, but for the consumers. The statement of the primary goals of the book is certainly inspiring:

1. To help each individual develop for himself an artistically honest standard for evaluating any dramatic production.
2. To provide a fairer means of judging the work of all those artists whose efforts are being witnessed.
3. To build a better audience, which will in turn demand a better theatre.

The task that Professor Wright has undertaken is neither simple nor easy. Sample these topics: "Defining Beauty," "Empathy and Aesthetic Distance," "What is Art?" For the uninitiated or novice playgoer this is tough meat indeed. However tough, the ardent playgoer will profit greatly in his understanding of the theatre from Professor Wright's thorough elaboration, not his simplicity.

The chapter entitled "The Audience and Dramatic Criticism" is especially rewarding to the theatrical consumer confused by the plethora of witty, clever reviews misleading the readers in diverse directions. The brief chapters dealing with the cinema and television draw remarkably clear analogies between the stage and the "younger media."

To the text the author has added line drawings, a useful glossary of terms, and several photographs. The photographs of productions and designs are worthwhile; the portraits of critics, directors, and actors are interesting, though they seem to this reviewer superfluous.

Altogether an honest and sincere effort toward a difficult goal, which although it may not hit the mark squarely, comes as close as anything I have seen to date.

GORDON E. BECK
University of Kansas

THE MAGIC-MAKER: E. E. CUMMINGS. By Charles Norman. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. xvi+400. $8.00.

In his first biography, E. E. Cummings receives the kind of attention which, at least once, ought to be guaranteed to every poet at birth. The author, Charles Norman, Cummings' friend of many years' standing who was given "complete access" to the poet's papers and correspondence, has justified his subject's confidence with a warmly sympathetic and copiously documented account of Cummings' life. He follows the poet from his boyhood in the affectionate home of his minister-professor father, through college days and graduate work

at Harvard and duty in the ambulance service and military imprisonment in World War I, to the mature life of the writer, who is also painter, in Paris and Greenwich Village. Oral interpreters will be especially interested in the long account of Cummings as a public reader during the past few years.

Emerging from the events of Cummings' life is the portrait of a warm and brave friend, and a generous and stimulating, if occasionally forbidding, public figure. Cummings, at sixty-four, "is not much different from the blond young poet who appeared so spectacularly a generation ago; he has remained an individual in the age of conformity, and the *enfant terrible* of the Twenties has stayed young doing so." He remains a rebel against any and all societies "of anonymous mass-men with rubber stamp inanities and cruelties," and he is a champion of "the individual and the underdog," who, as artist and technical innovator, thinks that art, "if it means to be anything, means *to be intensely alive*." His "final attitude" is that of the "*perfectly natural man* confronting the universe."

These are probably the dominant characteristics of a figure who will surely compel the attention of all those interested in the millioned declensions of the individual's relations to society and the universe; for surely Cummings, in his person and his work, is living witness to the extreme individualist emphasis—or as extreme, at least, as we can imagine its being managed by a person so fully *authorized* by both Upper and Lower Bohemia.

Doubtless the more analytical studies, of both man and artist, will be done by later biographers. Norman is plainly and frankly partisan, giving us here a kind of "official" biography. He dwells, for instance, with great gusto on that jolly moment when the gendarmes found Cummings taking a leak in a Paris street. But he turns his eyes, and ours, quickly away from Cummings' three marriages. Yet one might suppose the daring revelation to be the less relevant one, in its suggestion of the individualist's powers to cope with the universe.

I am not deriding Norman's work in suggesting its limitations. He may well leave it to persons like me, unacquainted with the poet, to make of him a convenient abstraction for speculation. Norman himself is properly kind and affectionate, quite as uncritical as a devoted friend and admirer should be, and most readers will be grateful for so full and cordial a study of a distinguished modern poet whose work has given much pleasure.

The publishers, incidentally, apparently take my view that this is an official biography, designed for libraries, Cummings "aficianados," and friends of the family. That is to say, while the book is interesting, its price is outrageous.

In being so harsh, I am, after all, but taking what might be called a Cummings-esque view of the publisher's case: since I do not have his responsibility to estimate the market for lives of the poets, I take great pleasure in telling him how disgusting *that* business is.

DON GEIGER
University of California, Berkeley

T. S. ELIOT: A SYMPOSIUM FOR HIS SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY. Edited by Neville Braybrooke. New York: Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, 1958; pp. 221. $5.00.

T. S. Eliot has been so firmly established for so long that the announcement of "fifty tributes in honour of Mr. Eliot's birthday" inspires hardly more than a yawn. It seems hardly possible that a birthday present made by so many hands this late in Eliot's career could be much more than a sentimental pastiche.

While a reading of the book confirms this prejudice to a certain degree, the staunchest anti-sentimentalist will be delighted by the objectivity of some selections. Most unexpectedly, for example, there are articles not wholly favorable to the master. In "Interpreting Becket and Other Parts," Robert Speaght, the actor who has played Becket over 1,000 times, comes to the conclusion that Eliot might have contributed more to the art of acting had he avoided drama and stuck to his poetry. Iris Murdoch clearly explains his too extreme rejection of the liberal morality at the heart of western culture today. In treating "T. S. Eliot as a Political Writer," T. M. Cameron points out the defects of Eliot's "eccentricity to English styles of thinking."

Not that the book is good merely because it offers some unfavorable criticisms of Eliot. To believe that would be as simple-mindedly extreme as are those who feel that lavish praise is the only legitimate function of literary appreciation. Either extreme is useless as an aid toward understanding Eliot. The book is good insofar as it is objective, not biased.

And it is objective in several ways. First, even those writers who see Eliot's weaknesses see them in the context of his whole achievement. They appreciate him for what he has done, not for some unrealistic idealization of what he is. Second, the book is objective in the sense

that it deals with various facets of Eliot's achievement. He is treated not only as a poet, but as a playwright, a classical scholar, a translator, a citizen. Third, his work is interpreted by people from the many walks of life upon which it impinges. Teachers and students discuss what it has meant to them. Film, stage, and television directors discuss the problems of interpreting his plays in their mediums. Fourth, his achievement is compared with that of other writers (W. B. Yeats and Lewis Carroll, for example).

From this many-faceted approach to his work Eliot emerges all the more human and important. These interpretations again demonstrate that his work, both in its weaknesses and its strengths, is a central articulation of our age.

IRVING DEER
State Normal College
Ellendale, N. D.

THE MODERN RESEARCHER. By Jacques Barzun and Henry F. Graff. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1957; pp. xiii+386. $6.00.

William James once observed that "you can give humanistic value to almost anything by teaching it historically." Columbia University historians Barzun and Graff extend this notion in asserting that students in every field will "profit from a conscious attention to the ways of the historian." Some scholars in other disciplines may be tempted to cavil at this concept of the universality of historical methods of research, but they should read this book before they do.

Although the authors view Research-and-Report as a single process ("The expression *is* the knowledge"), their treatment is necessarily bifurcated. For a reviewer who first learned about historiography from Langlois and Seignobos, Ogg, and Hockett, it is hard, but honest, to say that Barzun and Graff on research methods are equally penetrating in their analyses and far more sprightly in their style than any of these. In dealing with the art of writing they go well beyond any standard textbook on research, and they do it better than many English composition manuals. It is a conservative judgment to say that if all those who aspire to see their historical manuscripts appear in *QJS* or *SM* would study this book first, their chances of publication would be doubled, and the burdens of their editors would be halved.

Directors of graduate research owe it to those students undertaking historical studies to recommend this book, and graduate students owe it to themselves to read it.

J. JEFFERY AUER
Indiana University

THE AMERICANS: THE COLONIAL EXPERIENCE. By Daniel J. Boorstin. New York: Random House, 1958; pp. xii+434. $6.00.

This is the first of three promised volumes by Daniel J. Boorstin, Professor of History, University of Chicago, in which he plans to survey and interpret the intellectual history of America. As original investigation of the evidence, the volume is commendable although it turns up very little that is new to experienced students of this period. In the interpretation of this familiar material, however, the author has achieved remarkable freshness and in several respects his insight will provoke substantial and constructive re-thinking about the roots of American society.

The volume is arranged in four parts. Book One reviews the American Colonial problems of the Puritans, Quakers, Georgian philanthropists, and the Virginians. Included in these chapters are extensive, though often incidental, descriptions of occasions and habits of public address, as well as the intellectual and social life and some of the political problems of these four groups of settlers. The contrast which the author makes between the adaptability of the staunch Puritan orthodoxy to practical economics, geography, and politics and the stubbornness and loss of political leadership by the Quakers of Pennsylvania because of their refusals to modify some of their principles and customs will interest students of both discussion and persuasion. In another section, the oligarchy of Virginia planters is well described, with a penetrating analysis of the practical politics of elections of burgesses and vestrymen. Perhaps the emphasis upon the success of the planter-vestrymen in preventing an Anglican episcopate during Virginia's Colonial years will surprise some readers. The author calls it "practical godliness."

Book Two is topically arranged to present Colonial intellectual and professional life. Here, the strongest theme is an emphasis upon the importance of appeals by Americans to "self-evidence" rather than the writings of philosophers to determine the courses of American society. Other authors have called atten-

tion to the American reliance upon "common sense" as a yardstick of decision, but few, if any, have developed and stressed its importance to this extent. Some of the best chapters deal with the growth of colleges and the professions in America. Boorstin notes the regional rather than national, community-centered rather than cloistered, nature of the colleges. This, he believes, has led to much education of large numbers, but less of the community of scholars, which was often found in Europe at a national university. Likewise, he describes the slow growth of professionalism—the "unspecialized lawyer," the minister who was doctor, lawyer, politician, and teacher, and the amateur scientists who created a social pattern of wide-ranging curiosity which still exists among educated people after decades of increasingly specialized professionalism. We look forward to his treatment of this topic in later volumes.

Book Three is a good but not unusual study of "Language and the Printed Word." Here, for example, the author seems to accept the written evidence regarding causes and influences with slight attention to the dynamics of geography and traveling time and customs. Book Four is a brief extension of the theme of the non-professionalized American into "Warfare Diplomacy," in which Boorstin sees the seeds of modern isolationism in Colonial practices.

Students of the Colonial period of American speaking will find this is a useful addition to the literature which presents the intellectual background and climate of American speaking. Some specific discussions of the available evidence, as on Colonial legal speaking, will be helpful. With respect to the major viewpoints and interpretations, each reader will wish to decide how soundly the Colonial evidence supports the author or how much he relies upon hindsight.

GEORGE V. BOHMAN
Wayne State University

HERITAGE FROM HAMILTON. By Broadus Mitchell. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957; pp. viii+160. $3.75.

THE MIND OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON. Arranged and with an introduction by Saul K. Padover. New York: Harper, 1958; pp. vi+461. $6.50.

During the academic year 1956-57, Professor Broadus Mitchell delivered the Gino Speranza Lectures at Columbia University. Appropriately to the Bicentennial, all the lectures concerned the place of Alexander Hamilton in American traditions and ideals. The titles of the lectures suggest their substance: "Continentalist"; "Finance Minister"; "Party Leader"; "The Man in His Own Words." The handsome volume here reviewed is an outcome of the enterprise, which was obviously enriched by Professor Mitchell's many years of devotion to Hamilton studies, as exemplified in his definitive biography of Hamilton now under way.

Heritage from Hamilton offers no new knowledge, no startling discoveries to those who have followed the Hamilton literature. The style is somewhat more felicitous than that of certain rather pedestrian chapters in the first and published volume (*Alexander Hamilton: Youth to Maturity 1755-1788*) of Professor Mitchell's biography. The selections from Hamilton's correspondence are well chosen. The printing, the format, and the binding meet the high standards that book-lovers have come to expect of the Columbia University Press.

Professor Padover's collection has appeared a little late—it follows a spate of Hamilton books published during 1957, the Bicentennial year—to be of greatest utility. [See "Alexander Hamilton's Year," *QJS*, XLIII (1957), 427-432.] And like many other anthologists of Hamilton, Professor Padover does not always adequately identify the sources of his texts. One making a choice of anthologies would naturally give the preference to *Alexander Hamilton and the Founding of the Nation*, for which Professor Morris avowedly and demonstrably went to the original letters and documents.

In an introductory chapter entitled "The Controversial Mr. Hamilton" Professor Padover provides a biographical-critical essay that has the virtue of brevity. If it has other virtues that suggest its preference to other accounts of Hamilton, they are not apparent to this reviewer.

BOWER ALY
University of Oregon

THE JACKSONIAN PERSUASION: POLITICS AND BELIEF. By Marvin Meyers. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1957; pp. viii+231. $5.00.

ANDREW JACKSON AND NORTH CAROLINA POLITICS. By William S. Hoffmann. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958; pp. x+134. Paper $2.50.

These volumes represent opposite methods of historical writing. Professor Meyers presents a minimum of fact and a maximum of inter-

pretation, while Professor Hoffmann presents exhaustive detail with relatively little interpretation. Both authors are critical of the Jacksonians; Meyers is openly sympathetic to the Whigs. "The Whig party," he contends, "spoke to the explicit hopes of Americans as Jacksonians addressed their diffuse fears and resentments." Hoffmann concludes: "The Democrats were honest men who did little good; the Whigs were ambitious schemers whose policies would have been best for the country."

The Jacksonian Persuasion provides a close textual analysis of contemporary rhetoric with ingenious observations on the utterances of Andrew Jackson, Martin Van Buren, James Fenimore Cooper, Theodore Sedgwick, William Leggett, and Robert Rantoul. Van Buren, admittedly a vulnerable subject, becomes the object of devastating analysis. Dr. Meyers downs him on the psychoanalytical couch and, after a good deal of tilting of the Freudian ouija board, concludes that the Eighth President admired "flamboyant aristocrats" and was unhappy with his own image.

Meyers' observations will invariably please the Whiggish "new" conservatives now in fashion with the editors of *Time*, *Life*, and *Fortune*. Whatever virtue may exist in his volume, however, must be found in his interpretations and in his rhetorical analysis, for, as he says, he relies almost exclusively on "a new reading of some familiar sources."

Hoffmann's detailed description of North Carolina Jacksonianism, on the other hand, presents a great deal of new information about the confusing day-to-day entanglements of local, state, and national politics. A greater insight into political activity of this kind might have made Meyers less confident of sweeping generalizations based largely upon what politicians said.

R. G. G.

CREATED EQUAL? THE COMPLETE LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATES OF 1858. Edited with an introduction by Paul M. Angle. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958; pp. xxxiii+422. $7.50.

Created Equal? is by far the most readable, moving, and historically accurate report of the debates and their background yet published. Timed to appear during the centennial year of the Lincoln-Douglas campaign, the book jars the reader with the realization that three of the four basic issues of the debates remain as violent today as in 1858. The issues of (1) the status of the Negro, (2) the right of the states to regulate the Negro's status, and (3) need to obey decrees of the Supreme Court of the United States, are as controversial as in 1858. Only the issue of extension of slavery has been solved, and only the position of the Supreme Court on remaining issues has been changed during the one-hundred-year interval.

The book not only includes the seven traditional debates, five preliminary speeches by Lincoln and Douglas at Springfield and Chicago, and an historical introduction by Angle, but ties the five speeches and seven debates together with an unbiased description of events taking place between dates. Throughout the book, opposing newspaper accounts of speakers' acceptance are reported with a minimum of judgments or conclusions by Angle.

The texts of the speeches are those found in Lincoln's scrapbook, consisting of reports by newspapers friendly to the contestants. Lincoln's speeches are reported as corrected by Lincoln; Douglas' speeches remain as reported by the newspaper. Angle has included all interruptions and demonstrations of the crowd as reported by the partisan papers.

The editorial content tells enough of the background and attitudes of the people of Illinois to make the debates intelligible to any reader. Some of the details included would be known only to the diligent scholar. This reviewer recommends the book for required reading in courses on American oratory or rhetorical criticism.

Although Mr. Angle makes a valiant attempt at impartiality and fairness to both contestants, drawing a minimum number of conclusions on their comparative abilities, and comparing with little comment the partisan reports of opposing papers, one cannot help wondering how the same book would appear if it had been edited by George Fort Milton or some other scholarly admirer of Stephen A. Douglas.

FOREST WHAN
Kansas State College

THE COMING OF THE NEW DEAL. By Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959; pp. xii+669. $6.75.

Schlesinger's volume, the second of a series on *The Age of Roosevelt*, does much to recapture the milieu of those years of crisis. The scope of the book is, with a few exceptions, limited to the years 1933 and 1934. The period covered begins with the One Hundred Days

during which Roosevelt sent fifteen messages to Congress, secured the passage of fifteen major laws, delivered ten speeches, held bi-weekly press conferences, and made all the major domestic and foreign policy decisions of the government. It concludes with the emergence of conservative opposition to Roosevelt's programs.

Throughout there are incisive thumbnail sketches of the men around Roosevelt during the early New Deal days: Howe, Johnson, Ickes, Hopkins, Richberg, Lewis, Wallace, Tugwell, and others whose loyalties and feuds gave the New Deal an *ethos* all its own.

A clear and well ordered description of the various New Deal agencies is provided. Consideration is given to the forces at play in the birth of the major agencies, the debates that accompanied their establishment, and their eventual development.

The book is divided into eight major sections. The first six treat major areas of New Deal activity such as agriculture and labor. The seventh considers the conservative resurgence. The eighth considers the Presidency under Roosevelt. This latter section will be of particular interest to those concerned with the problems of communication and decision-making in public administration. The present day operation of the Executive branch of government with its staff system and the heated debate about Presidential leadership, or the lack thereof, stands in sharp contrast with the dynamics of decision as practiced by Roosevelt. Schlesinger concludes that the Rooseveltian chain of command was deliberately disorganized, the grants of authority purposefully incomplete, and the multiplicity of agencies deliberately designed to insure that all major problems would be brought to Roosevelt for his personal decision and to retain for him the maximum opportunity for administrative maneuver.

The section devoted to Roosevelt's methods of preparing speeches is generally accurate, but too brief to be really useful. The importance of his speeches is recognized, however, and useful comments and evaluations are interspersed throughout the book as his speeches are considered in their context. Roosevelt's skill in speaking in press conferences and the parallel with the British parliamentary question period are considered in helpful detail.

On the whole the book presents a balanced view of the New Deal; representative quotations from devoted followers, hostile critics, and thoughtful evaluators are threaded together as the major issues are presented. In all, it is a most useful volume for the student of the speaking of this period.

AUSTIN J. FREELEY
John Carroll University

THE ARTICULATES. Edited by John M. Henry. Introduction by Virgil M. Hancher. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1957; pp. 251. $4.00.

This book contains twenty-one essays by twenty-one anonymous authors. A respected university president testifies in an introductory statement that the authors are persons of "intelligence, experience and position." Subjects range from conservation to federal world government. Four essays deal with problems in journalism.

Only one of the chapters, that entitled "The Intellectual Gigolo Strikes Back," is concerned directly with oral communication. The author, a speech-writer for Republican Presidential candidates in the campaigns from 1936 to 1956, seeks to defend his ghost-writing activities. Sensitive to criticism that he occupied an inferior position in the campaigns, he says that he regarded the candidates "as a means by which I might communicate, as an individual, to the people." He assures us that the candidates' ideas were quite easy to grasp and write, since they were those of the party leaders around them. He completes the destruction of our political illusions by saying, "the major reason the Great Man is great at all is because I, and fellows like me, . . . have called him great until the adjective stuck." Although the author seems to exaggerate the situation, his frank discussion is a good antidote to the hero-worship approach to campaign speaking.

The chapter on ghost-writing, however, raises some of the same troublesome questions about anonymity that are posed by the philosophy underlying the whole book. This philosophy is of more interest to speech students than are the essays themselves. Starting with a concept familiar to us, that what the audience think of the communicator will influence their reception of his recommendations, the editor argues that "an idea can be judged solely on its merit . . . only if the influence of the author's name and position is removed." Lincoln, Washington, and Jefferson are cited as examples of leaders who sought to avoid "the automatic and unreasoned preconceptions" of their audiences by presenting their ideas, on occasion, through associates. One could point also to writers who have published under pseudonyms,

including "Junius," an author of particular interest to the critic of speechmaking.

That there are times to speak and times to keep silent, and that, at a given moment, individual A may be able to present a particular idea with more chance of success than individual B, cannot be denied. But important questions are raised by the conclusion that therefore we should provide a "Platforms Anonymous" and encourage our leaders to speak out their true thoughts under its protection. Does this make it too easy for people to escape the responsibilities of their suggestions? Does it put the stamp of approval on "trial-ballooning," a temptation to which our political leaders have been known to succumb, and the consequent sophistry of telling your audience mainly what you know they want to hear? In the last analysis, can the man really be separated from the thought? Since we are so dependent upon others for our information, can we completely evaluate a thought without knowing something about its source—about the background, prejudices, and motives of its author? Would an easy acceptance of the philosophy of anonymity tend to "freeze" the utterances of public figures at the level of the images of themselves and their thinking that they have established with their audiences? Would it be better for our society if we discouraged the use of the mask and insisted that our communicators speak out courageously and that their audiences listen objectively and evaluatively, with a full realization of the interplay among the basic elements of the communicative situation?

It is interesting that when it came to the important job of convincing the reader that the book presented the real thoughts of people of some standing, the editor and publisher did not have the testifier remain anonymous, but made a point of his name and position.

ORVILLE HITCHCOCK
State University of Iowa

SPEECH IS OF TIME. By R. G. Menzies. London: Cassell, 1958; pp. 246. $2.75.

In Australia Prime Minister Menzies is widely regarded as second only to Churchill among contemporary orators. The speeches in this volume, like Menzies' speeches to the United States Congress and those in his collection *To The People of Britain at War* (1941), do not provide support for such a claim.

Speech is of Time contains eleven speeches and five essays composed over the past decade—a period in which Australia has been confronted by many important domestic and international issues. Yet, strangely enough, there is not a single speech devoted to Australian affairs *per se*. In his Preface the author discloses that he has published the book for the benefit of students of contemporary history, but the only subject of significance that is dealt with is the Suez Canal issue—and that in five speeches which are frequently repetitive. The other speeches are memorial orations and lectures delivered in Australia before learned societies on such topics as "Democracy and Management," "Modern Science and Civilization," and "The British Commonwealth."

The most interesting of the orations is one delivered at the University of Melbourne on "Churchill and his Contemporaries" in which Menzies vindicates MacDonald, Chamberlain, Baldwin, and Lloyd George. This speech has special piquancy since Menzies has been charged with the same pre-war negligence as these, his British counterparts.

In the speeches on Suez, Menzies admits the legitimacy of Egypt's nationalization of the canal, yet rejects the argument that if it is in order for the United States to operate the Panama Canal without assistance from a Users' Association, it should be in order for Egypt to operate the Suez Canal without outside help. Indeed, the logical basis of Menzies' speeches on Suez is not very convincing.

Of the eleven speeches the five parliamentary speeches are the best. They are good examples of deliberative oratory. The memorial orations lack the interest and stylistic finesse of the political addresses: it would seem that they did not engage the speaker's full interest and enthusiasm. After all, Menzies is a politician and it should be expected that he would be at his best in parliamentary debate.

In matters of speech style Menzies gives evidence of considerable use of alliteration, makes frequent use of literary quotation, shows a familiarity with the classical orators, uses analogy to advantage, but fails to make extensive use of emotional and sound logical proof.

This volume will not enhance Menzies' stature as a speaker.

A. L. MCLEOD
State University of New York, Fredonia

TELEVISION AND RADIO WRITING. By Stanley Field. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958; pp. xv+544. $6.75.

TELEVISION WRITING AND SELLING. (Second edition.) By Edward Barry Roberts. Boston: The Writer, Inc., 1957; pp. xxiv+504. $6.50.

These two books are quite different in intention and therefore properly different in structure. Stanley Field, as Chief of Production for the Radio-TV Branch of the Army, has written or supervised almost every possible type of radio or TV script, and his attempt to compress the whole world of writing for broadcast is commendable. His book falls short, however, in its very ambition; trying to cover everything, he must cover most things superficially, and he ends with a survey of the writing field, rather than with a good working text.

There is, of course, merit in *Television and Radio Writing*. The chapter on the government information program is complete and informative, and is a unique contribution. The succinct chapter on production essentials would be of great value to a beginning student of *writing* who has had no contact with *production*. The overview of the entire broadcast field is well organized and objective.

It is to Mr. Field's follow-through that one must take exception. Perhaps he is right to devote almost half of his book to TV drama and only twenty-three pages to radio drama; but of these twenty-three, eleven are given over to a script of the radio *Gunsmoke* series, with little or no analysis. Indeed, his brief analyses are the major defect of the book; he has too many examples, quoted too fully, and with insufficient commentary. His chapter on the documentary, for example, gives us a complete insight into Lou Hazam's experiences in writing, filming, and producing *Monganga*, but provides very little help in the planning of the types of documentary writing which a student would be likely to do. In all, Mr. Field's book might be useful in a beginning course intended to survey the entire area of writing for broadcast, or for a class in continuity writing. It would not be as helpful in a course in dramatic writing for either medium.

Ed Roberts is Eastern Story Editor for CBS, and confines his book to television drama. Despite the title, *Television Writing and Selling*, he devotes less than 10% of his 500 pages to the last word in the title. As one might expect, his frame of reference is the network script, and his advice to the free-lance writer is practical and complete. For a class in dramatic writing, his discussions of such technical factors as settings and special effects, camera directions, problems of time, of exposition and transitions, are full and most helpful. His examples are well chosen, are quoted just fully enough, and usually demonstrate good literary quality, as well as the special adaptations to the television medium which Mr. Roberts is pointing out.

This may not be the ideal text on TV dramatic writing for which many of us have been waiting, but in its recent revised edition, with its cognizance of the increasing influence of film and the advent of video tape, it will certainly do for now.

EDWARD STASHEFF
University of Michigan

COLLEGE TEACHING BY TELEVISION. Edited by John C. Adams, C. R. Carpenter, and Dorothy R. Smith. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1958; pp. xii+234. $4.00.

The rapidly growing school population and the increasing necessity for a better educational product are forcing upon schools a careful and, at times, painful reappraisal of educational procedures. One of the more publicized means being considered for helping with some of education's problems is television. In spite of the publicity which it has received, widespread ignorance prevails among academics concerning present and proposed educational uses for television. *College Teaching by Television*, if read, could do much to dispel this ignorance. It might be added parenthetically that, though the field of speech is not specifically mentioned in the book, many teachers of speech have been experimenting with the medium. It is possible that further exploration and experimentation in our field may be stimulated by this report.

One of the pioneering groups in the vigorous promotion of television for instructional purposes has been the American Council on Education. Since 1952, the Council has sponsored four conferences of persons experienced in and concerned with this use of television. The present publication is an account of the fourth of these conferences. The participants tended to be persons already committed, in some degree, to the idea of television in the classroom. You will find few voices of protest raised in these pages. However, neither will you find the educational medicine man extolling television as a panacea for all of the aches and pains of education. The presentation is one-sided but intelligent.

The quality of the book varies greatly, which is understandable in light of the variety of contributors. This reader was disappointed to

find that, in general, those who appeared on the program primarily in the role of classroom teachers had least to say. This was especially interesting since one of the assumptions underlying the conference was that "the time was . . . ripe to provide a public platform for teachers to express their judgments, opinions, and conclusions."

The best papers in the book have import far beyond the province of instructional television. These are papers concerned with basic educational problems and, in some cases, the possible role of television in their solution. Probably the outstanding contribution, certainly the most original, is by John E. Ivey, Executive Vice-President of New York University. Ivey stresses the importance of studying the college as a system or culture rather than looking at isolated segments. He demonstrates the naïveté of those who attempt to improve the college by superimposing a new program, such as an honors program or television, on an existing structure without regard for the system as a whole.

Other particularly good papers are by psychologists Ray Carpenter and Neal Miller and by Clarence Faust, President of the Fund for the Advancement of Education. The section of Carpenter's paper in which he points out areas in which additional instructional television research is needed is especially worthwhile. Miller's paper is a fine interpretation of the accumulated research on the psychology of learning and the relevance of such research to the practical problems of education, on or off television. Faust makes an intelligent appraisal of the role which television might play in education.

SAMUEL L. BECKER
State University of Iowa

TELEVISION AND RADIO ANNOUNCING. By Stuart W. Hyde. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959; pp. xii+451. $6.00.

A textbook on the highly developed skill of announcing could focus on the "how to," and could enhance its substance by presenting principles, illustrated and codified into a method of training. This work takes another direction; it provides suggestions and materials for practice, within a body of factual information of concern to the prospective announcer. Major shortcomings seem to involve questions of proportion and relevance of materials. For example, a reprint of an existing case history of a three-minute commercial consumes eleven pages of Chapter Seven, while all of Chapter Twelve is exhausted in three and one-half pages. The initial chapter includes an elaborate pedagogical interpretation of responses to certain student-dispatched questionnaires. Clearly relevant would be a reasoned distinction between the respective characteristics of, and training required for, television and radio announcing. Instead, one gains the impression that television is little more than radio with gesture and more gadgets. Broadcast conditions in California are amply described, rather than critically appraised. Units of information often reiterate but do not supplant that found in texts covering related fields. Students majoring in radio-television, for instance, will find variations on familiar themes: kinds of programs, FCC regulations, logging, and broadcasting hardware (the timely opportunity to comment on video tape, however, is overlooked). The broad sweep of subject matter produces curious statements: "The key to successful radio and television announcing is the ability to communicate. Having said this, much of the value of this book has now been communicated" (p. 9). "The question mark (?) appears at the end of those sentences which ask a question" (p. 27). "To overcome the problems inherent in pronunciation, a system called the International Phonetic Alphabet has been devised" (p. 79).

Despite its limitations, the merits of this work will probably warrant its adoption in many quarters. Information on the announcer's audience rapport, foreign pronunciation, and television newscasts is particularly valid. Bibliographical data in several chapters are helpful, although the student might benefit further from a single annotated bibliography, classified according to subject. Part Two consists of 241 perforated pages of rich exercise material, "obtained entirely from actual broadcast sources" (p. viii). Another companion to the text proper is an LP record, purchasable from the publisher; this aural aid supplements the chapters on pronunciation. No doubt students will like the specific, practical information, the sound illustrative material, and the handsome format of this text.

JEROME LANDFIELD
Oberlin College

A COMPENDIUM OF RESEARCH AND THEORY ON STUTTERING. By Charles F. Diehl. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1959. pp. 314. $9.75.

It is perhaps significant that collections of articles in speech pathology have recently been

appearing. This, apparently, is an indication that writing and research in our field are becoming voluminous, as well as an indication that many people are feeling the need for a summing up and re-evaluation of what has been done. The *Compendium of Research and Theory on Stuttering* complements other attempts to integrate work in speech pathology by covering a wider source of references (abstracts from 30 journals are included) and by going deeper into the one area of stuttering (193 abstracts and 364 additional reading references are included).

The reviewer found these abstracts very fascinating despite having read a number of the articles in their original form. The juxtaposition of earlier studies with more recent ones dealing with the same general topics helped to give an appreciation of the development (or sometimes a lack of development) in thinking and methodology that has characterized the field of speech pathology.

In general, the abstracting has been well done. Most abstracts convey the main purposes and content of the original articles without distortion.

As with any similar collection, the reader might question the omission of certain articles or the organization of the abstracts. The reviewer felt that the book might have been made more useful by subdividing units of study (I. History, II. Symptomatology, III. Etiology—Physiological, IV. Etiology—Psychological, and V. Therapy). This rather broad grouping and a somewhat superficial indexing make it difficult to locate articles dealing with many important topics of study.

In summary, the main purpose of the *Compendium* ("merely to bring together a great deal of what already exists" by including articles representative of each of the five units of study) seems to have been accomplished. This book should be a valuable reference book for students in speech correction.

HAROLD L. LUPER
University of Georgia

THE WORLD'S GREAT SPEECHES. (Second revised edition.) Edited by Lewis Copeland and Lawrence Lamm. New York: Dover Publications, 1958; pp. xix+754. Paper $2.49.

This revised, paperback edition contains 255 speeches of which 114 are abridgements or excerpts. This new edition with its many additions has been expanded from 537 pages and includes speeches delivered since 1942. Part I, Great Speeches of Earlier Times, stands untouched, but elsewhere speeches have been omitted, added, and rearranged under new topic headings. Weaknesses retained are: sketchy and usually inadequate headnotes which never reveal the sources of texts; no indications of where omissions occur; a topical index of twenty-six subjects which is of little use because references are to speeches rather than to specific pages; the inclusion of speeches apparently chosen for their brevity rather than for their significance. This large, low-priced collection may be of interest to the casual reader, but its weaknesses preclude its use for careful and serious study of oratory in or out of the classroom.

JOHN F. WILSON
Cornell University

A PICTURE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH THEATRE. By Raymond Mander and Joe Mitchenson. New York: Macmillan, 1957; pp. 160; 538 plates. $5.95.

Messrs. Mander and Mitchenson display in pictures and text British legitimate theatre from 1576 to 1957. Limited to the "classic repertoire," *British Theatre* divides periods and pictures as follows: Elizabethan to Commonwealth, 27; Restoration to death of Queen Anne, 41; Georgian (1714-1811), 117; Regency (1811-1837), 58; Victorian, 146; Twentieth Century, 149.

The authors have judiciously selected pictures of theatres, plays, actors, and playwrights, but their text now and again proves repetitious and inaccurate. For example, George Anne Bellamy appears six years too late, while Lucretia Bradshaw (d. 1755)—according to the text—capers with Garrick in *The Farmer's Return from London* seven years after her death. Although inconsistencies may be attributed either to careless proofreading or poor scholarship, perhaps the most provocative caption in *British Theatre* concerns Tom King, described as "the actor who commenced his life as a pastrycook."

EUGENE K. BRISTOW
Indiana University

COMMUNICATION SKILLS—THE BASIC COURSE. By King Hendricks, Hubert W. Smith, Moyle Q. Rice, and Rex E. Robinson. San Francisco: J. W. Stacey, 1958; pp. xiii+280. $5.00.

This spiral-bound book is intended for students in the integrated communications course which attempts to teach reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Organized for a three-

quarter system, it can be adapted to a two-semester course. The balance between speaking and writing is generally good, although the authors include only models of writing and give the student of speech little in the way of great speaking to read.

Some of the "special" items, such as "Student Record," "Reading and Progress Record," and "Proposed Time Table," seem to be aimed especially toward the communication skills course as taught by the authors and might need considerable adaptation for another course at another university.

The content is good and is well organized. If some of the suggested topics for themes and speeches seem unnecessarily simple, this is probably due to the low state of communication ability displayed by many entering freshmen in our colleges.

DAVID C. RALPH
Michigan State University

TEACHING THE MOTHER TONGUE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS. By P. Gurrey. New York: Longmans, Green, 1958; pp. x+219. $2.50.

Professor Gurrey, a British educator, addresses his book directly to teachers, and especially to students in training to become teachers of English in the secondary school. He hopes to reach those "who have open minds that are still alight with the spirit of curiosity, adventure, and the will to know" (p. vii). The reviewer believes the author has achieved his purpose. The book contains many concrete and practical suggestions, and the chapters on "Writing" and "The Correction of Written Work" are filled with teaching devices designed to make students feel that "they come to school to learn what is outside school, and to master skills they will use in the outside world" (p. 98).

The underlying purpose throughout the book is to motivate the student to use the mother tongue effectively. The teacher of English is urged to remember that it is the students' minds, attitudes, and personalities that he is influencing.

The positive thinking of Professor Gurrey is both stimulating and encouraging. I recommend the book to teachers of English, and I wish that a speech teacher would write a similar book for teaching speech in the secondary school.

CLARA K. MAWHINNEY
Bradley University

AMERICAN EDUCATION. THE THIRTY-SECOND DISCUSSION AND DEBATE MANUAL, 1958-59. Edited by Bower Aly. Columbia, Mo.: Lucas Bros. Published by arrangement with the Committee on Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation. National University Extension Association. 1958; Vol. I, pps. 1-220; Vol. II, pps. 1-220.

These volumes represent an admirable collection of argumentative essays on American education by able and distinguished writers. Volume I consists of essays expressly written for the debate manual, while volume II is a selection of significant essays and addresses which have appeared elsewhere. In both volumes Mr. Aly is to be commended for his editorial selection. The studies are well arranged and will be indispensable to the debater, whether on school or college level. And the faculty member wholly unconcerned with debating will find these volumes of interest for informing him of critical issues in American education, and of the most significant contrasts between our educational system and those of Russia, Germany, France, and England. There is also a limited amount of useful technical advice on debate and discussion.

When a reader reflects on the maturity of judgment required to reach sound conclusions on these issues, or even to state them in a form that makes it possible to discuss them in a short period of time, he may be a little appalled at the spectacle of the school or college debater confidently concluding that our educational system must be immediately revised in a particular way, or continued as it is. And some educators quoted in these volumes would undoubtedly say that these students should be equipping themselves with the tools of sound learning instead of attempting to reach decisions on questions beyond their years. This certainly raises the question of the place of rhetoric in a revised system of education. Rhetoric debates not what may be determined scientifically, but those matters which are uncertain and contingent. Should the student who is to be well educated in this time of appalling need for scientists be allowed to spend his time in debating about education?

EVERETT HUNT
Swarthmore College

SHOP TALK

RICHARD MURPHY, *Editor*

Postal Persuasion

When Aristotle set the rhetoricians to work studying all available means of persuasion, he lived in simple, erudite, fourth century B.C. Athens. There were no neon signs advertising beer, no sky writing for the colas, no singing commercials for deodorants . . . and no metered messages on envelopes.

For a year or so our office has been collecting postage meter sentiments received from colleges. When we got several bushels, we sorted to select some favorites: "Henderson—the School With a Heart," Arkadelphia, Ark.; "Mississippi's Fastest Growing College," Hattiesburg; "The Friendly College" (Black Hills), Spearfish, South Dakota; "Invest in God's Tomorrow" (Westmar College), Le Mars, Iowa; "Tomorrow's Future Begins Tonight" (Bradley), Peoria, Illinois; "Kearney Graduates Are Always in Demand," Kearney, Nebraska; "A Baylor Education Insures Your Future," Waco, Texas; "Education at a Mile High Level," Fort Collins, Colorado; "Built on Acres of Diamonds" (Temple), Philadelphia.

Some of the colleges use a rather standard slogan, such as West Virginia University's "The State Is Our Campus," but others supply mailmen and correspondents with a variety of specific information. You can learn when the next session of Columbia University opens, that Adelphi has new dormitories for men, Valparaiso University is a century old, and The University of Miami Symphony is in its thirty-second anniversary year. The most generally used figure is the little lamp of learning, in the standard verbal form of "Higher Education —Keep It Bright." There are variations of slogan, such as "United Negro College Fund," and "Support Akron U."

The cachet, of course, is an old device, much beloved by philatelists. It usually gives some historical detail, but no adjuring you to do anything about it. Take two examples from our collection. This was the centennial day of Mark Twain's birth, one says. Mark, Huck, and Tom are handsomely sketched in color, and the envelope is stamped Hannibal, Missouri, November 30, 1935. John Adams was born 200 years ago that day, says the other. There is a picture of the house in which he was born, and the envelope is stamped Quincy, Mass., October 19, 1935. The Postmaster General extended the cachet device to his cancellation machines, and we have been under postal persuasion ever since.

There is always a stern tone to the General's directives: "Tie Securely—Mail Early"; "Aliens Must Register"; "Buy U. S. Bonds"; "Employ the Handicapped"; "Fight Infantile Paralysis"; "Pledge Blood Now"; "Give Red Cross Fund." The old standby, used especially heavily when the state department makes a statement, is "Pray for Peace." State and local governments have taken up the notion. "Official Business, State of Texas, State Penalty for Private Use" is red-inked on an envelope from the University of Texas. Our own secretary of state instructs us to "Come Back from Your Vacation—Drive Safely." He even

initials the message to make sure it is taken as a personal one. The Village of Oak Park advises us, "Please No Grass Clippings in Gutters." The movement seems to be international. From London comes "Express Good Wishes—Greetings and Telegrams," and from Bern, "Gesundheit und Lebensfreude durch WINTERSPORT." Postal persuasion seems now to cover all the aspects of rhetoric, to inform, to please, to move the passions. We thought we had better see what we could do about two-way communication by getting a machine of our own.

We sent off a tear coupon from one of those Pitney-Bowes postage meter ads which tell you how you, too, can express yourself on the envelope. While we waited, we let our imagination soar. Not only would the little machine be useful for adding last moment information we forgot to put in the envelope, such as "Sorry to miss deadline—will do better next time—support your blood bank," but perhaps we could at long last retaliate. For all mail going to the federal government, such slogans as these might help: "Lower Taxes"; "Balance the Budget"; "Get a Program for Peace"; "Give Some Blood Yourself." Or to the secretary of state who was so solicitous of our welfare, "How About Fixing That Chuck Hole on Route 150." Perhaps something of a literary flavor, with footnotes, could be used. In sending back payment for a utilities bill, "Put Out the Light, and Then—Put Out the Light" (*Othello,* V, ii) might do for a start. To someone who, after repeated requests, doesn't send on that obituary we need for the next issue, this would be a timely sentiment in double entendre:

> But in dear words of human speech
> We two communicate no more.
> *In Memoriam,* LXXXV

Within a week of our Pitney-Bowes inquiry, in came a big envelope, nicely postage-metered, with the slogan "It's Faster—It's Neater—Mailed by Meter." Several hours later, and before we could examine the packet, in came the company's own man, Mr. Harold M. Corray, who presented his card. Our horror at what mailing one innocent, no obligation, please send information, tear coupon had wrought, was somewhat abated by learning he was from the Peoria office, and not the home, Stamford, Connecticut, campus. He was very nice about the matter, said he had some errands in the neighborhood, and wasn't inconvenienced at all. After surveying kind and extent of our mail, he advised getting Model DM, known as the baby style. It meters the envelope, sticks the flap, and imprints a seven or eight word box of persuasion—all in one operation. The little slogans or sentiments are stamped from plates; they haven't invented any way of designing the machine for impromptu rhetoric. You can have as many plates as you want, however, and keep them in a sort of postal rebuttal box for ready use.

Our meter man estimated that if you spend as much as a dollar a day on postage, his machine will pay off in general efficiency, unfrayed nerves, and so on. There are other purposes the machine serves that could scarcely be reckoned in price—health, for example, with licking eliminated. What price a machine which puts into public circulation your best gnomes, maxims, aphorisms, saws, and other expressions in sententious form? The meter could be a cure for calamaphobia! Unlike Western Union, Pitney-Bowes, Inc. does not supply sentiments. Cost? Our man told us, but said he would prefer we did not announce it. He likes to explain the price face to face, but he said he wouldn't mind our estimating the dues

of the baby model for a year as about equal to three or four sustaining memberships in SAA.

The machines are not sold, but rented by the year. They are taken to the post office periodically, where you pay for as much postage as you may wish to dispense, and the machine is set. We asked our man if he ever encountered anybody who thought the meter could be bought and run independent of any payments to the revenuers, like a money-making machine, but he just smiled. Philatelists hate him, he says. Once when he tried to sell a contract to a stamp dealer, not knowing, of course, what the man's calling was, he ran into violence. He didn't make the sale, but he got off alive by arguing that the more meters sold, the greater the holdings value of the stamp dealer. "The best sales line I ever used," he said.

Our financial and rhetorical resources being what they are, we decided to stick to stamps. It's a good stamp year. At the moment there are two special and one regular Lincoln stamps to be licked. Unfortunately we can find no evidence on how effective metered suasion may be. All available collections of abstracts list no such study as "An Experimental Investigation of the Intended and Extended Effect of Meter Rhetoric on Overt Behavioral Responses of a Random Sample." The system has one obvious inadequacy: the executive mind is untouched; not even a junior executive opens his own mail. And it has a hazard. As the secretary flips through the mail prior to turning over the envelopes and slitting the flies, she is exposed to powerful rhetorical rays at the subliminal level. Our field men report cases of secretaries who find themselves in night school, at the bloodbank, even on winter sport excursions, without having the slightest notion of where the urge came from.

In the beginning there was rhetoric. Then came the industrial revolution. Of making available the means of persuasion, will there be no end?

SHOP TALK SPEECH CONVENTION CALENDAR

National

Speech Association of America: Statler, Washington, December 28-30; (1960, The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30; 1961, New York; 1962, Cleveland; 1963 [August], Denver).

American Educational Theatre Association: with SAA in Washington; (1960, University of Denver, August 28-30; 1961, Waldorf-Astoria, New York, August 28-30; 1962, University of Minnesota, August 24-26; 1963, University of Oregon, August 26-28; 1964, University of Pittsburgh, August 27-29).

American Speech and Hearing Association: Statler, Cleveland, November 11-14; (1960, Statler, Los Angeles, November).

Delta Sigma Rho: John Carroll University, Cleveland, May 7-9.

Regional

Eastern States: Henry Hudson Hotel, New York, April 9-11. (Golden anniversary convention.)

Southern States: Sheraton-Seelbach, Louisville, April 6-10.

Central States: Statler, Detroit, April 10-11.

Related Organizations

American Association for Cleft Palate Rehabilitation: Sheraton, Philadelphia, April 30, May 1-2.

Acoustical Society of America: Ottawa, May 14-16.

International Association of Logopedics and Phoniatrics: London, August 17-22.

CONVENTION PROGRAM. Readers may be interested in the time table for the Washington convention in December. Here is Vice President Kenneth G. Hance's schedule for assembling the program.

Jan. 15 Letter from Vice President K. G. Hance to Program Sponsors

Jan. 25 Letter from V.P. to interest group

and committee officers re. business meetings

Feb. 15 Preparation by V.P. of tentative convention schedule and room assignments

Mar. 14 Meeting of AETA and SAA officers in Washington, D. C., to complete arrangements with the Hotel Statler

**Apr. 15 *Deadline for submitting program copy to V.P.* (with possibility of making alterations as late as July 1)

June 1 Distribution by V.P. to Program Sponsors of mimeographed copy of entire convention program

July 1 Deadline for receipt by V.P. of edited mimeographed copy of convention program

July 15 Transmission by V.P. to Executive Secretary Peterson of copy for "Convention Preview"

Sept. 15 Transmission by V.P. to Executive Secretary of all final copy

Nov. 1 Deadline for receipt by V.P. of last-minute changes in programs—for inclusion in "Supplement"

Nov. 15 Transmission by V.P. to Executive Secretary of copy for "Supplement"

The Vice President has called the attention of programmers to two statements of the Legislative Assembly, passed at the last convention:

(1) The Assembly "endorses the principle that members of the Association should, whenever possible, limit themselves to the presentation of a single paper during the programs of a given convention."

(2) The Assembly "recommends that the Interest Groups adopt the policy that abstracts or outlines of papers and speeches to be presented at the convention should be submitted to sectional chairmen one month in advance of the convention."

ASOA PROGRAM. At the business meeting of the Rhetoric and Public Address interest group last convention, a policy of having manuscripts of convention papers submitted in advance was discussed but not approved. Someone mentioned the Acoustical Society of America as a model of this sort of thing. We wrote to Wallace Waterfall, secretary of the society, 335 East 45th Street, New York 17, and promptly received a complimentary copy—regular price of programs a year to non-members is $2.00. Abstracts of all papers are printed in the program, which is mailed in advance of the convention. There are two types of papers, one called "Invited Paper," of thirty minutes, and "Contributed Paper," of fifteen minutes. The abstracts are four to five hundred words.

Secretary Waterfall reports that 550 members and guests attended the ASOA Chicago meeting in November. The form of application for membership reads: "The By-Laws provide that any natural person may apply to be either an Associate or a Member of the Society." Only the secretary's approval of an applicant's interest is sufficient for associate membership, but applicants for full membership must file their credentials and be approved by the membership committee and by the executive council. Dues are $8.00 and $10.00.

CONVENTION REPORT. The report of the proceedings, International Association of Logopedics and Phoniatrics summer congress in London (see calendar), can be procured from the secretary, Peggy Carter, 46, Canonbury Square, London, N. 1, if ordered by July. Price is 17/6d., about $2.45, but consult your postmaster when you get your international money order.

FOR KEEPS. American Educational Theatre Association announces three *life* memberships. A straight life policy comes at $150, sustaining at $250, and contributing at $1000. Rights and privileges are the same in all classes; it's the honor of the thing.

AETA has bestowed a lifetime membership on Edward Gordon Craig, distinguished English producer, designer, artist, and author. He now lives in Vence (near the French Riviera). A friend of ST's received a letter last January, in reply to a cabled best wishes on his 87th birthday, in which Mr. Craig advised (ignoring his own strenuous life):

> I hope you are well and not overworked. I daresay you can agree with me that to overwork is to spoil Nature's plan.
>
> I know that it's one of the very few sins—to overwork.
>
> It wastes strength, wastes time—and wastes life. Nature, I feel sure, whispers us to play a little more—*play* with strength—and time and life will last longer.
>
> I wonder if you agree.

Sounds like sound advice.

INVITATION

Fred Haberman, vice-chairman and arranger for the Rhetoric and Public Address Interest Group program at the December SAA convention, announces an invitational section, to be titled *Debut*. In an effort to discover hidden talent, these conditions are imposed for eligibility of applicants:

1. Is a member of SAA
2. Has not appeared on a national SAA program (or comparable program in another field)
3. Has not published an article in *QJS, Speech Monographs, The Speech Teacher* (or comparable journals in other fields)

Papers may be on any subject in the area, are limited to 1600-2000 words (about fifteen minutes when spoken), and should be submitted to W. Norwood Brigance, Wabash College, chairman of the program, by July 31. Four papers will be selected for presentation at the Washington, D. C., convention.

OF, BY, AND FOR. We were speculating last summer about how Mr. Lincoln may have delivered his famous lines, "of the people, by the people, and for the people"—whether the accent was on the noun or the prepositions. It suddenly flashed through our mind that years ago we heard a savant who had heard Lincoln, tell how it had been done originally. The memory of man being what it is, we couldn't recall the name of our informant or how he said it was done. We did remember, however, that we heard the story at a convention in Gettysburg, about 1928, and that our informer was a member of the faculty of the college there.

We wrote to Raymond S. Davis, director of public information at Gettysburg College, and got a prompt, definitive answer:

> Philip Melanchthon Bikle was the man who gave you his account of the battle and Lincoln's address. He was graduated from Gettysburg College with the class of 1866. After teaching elsewhere for several years he began his long career as a professor at Gettysburg College in 1874, became dean in 1889 and in 1925 became dean emeritus. He was born Dec. 1, 1844 at Smithsburg, Md., and died Jan. 19, 1934 at Gettysburg.

Mr. Davis added that he had called Professor Robert Fortenbaugh, present head of the history department, and discovered he had a memo prepared by Mr. Bikle. He suggested that sometime later I write to Mr. Fortenbaugh about it; he was at the moment ill. When we wrote several months later, he replied that he couldn't supply the memo at the time Mr. Davis called him, because he had a touch of heart trouble and felt it unwise to climb to his second floor office for the "document . . . which I only could locate." He had it now. He noted that Dean Bikle was his Latin teacher, and often spoke of the time he heard Lincoln give the address. He had given his story in detail at a convention of Kappa Phi Kappa at a Gettysburg hotel in 1928, and that evidently was the occasion I referred to. Around this period, he said, he had asked Dean Bikle to "write out and sign his story for me." From a two-page, single space account, Professor Fortenbaugh on November 24, 1958, excerpted the heart of the matter and sent this account to us:

> A few years ago, when I, as Gettysburg's representative, attended the inauguration of President Shanklin of Wesleyan University, the regulations governing the seating of the delegates brought together quite frequently Dr. Hancock and myself. Dr. H. at that time was in charge of the English Department of Haverford College and represented that institution at the inauguration. One of the points he brought up in our conversation was this: "Mr. Lincoln, in his Gettysburg speech, used this expression, 'Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.' Where do you think emphasis ought to be placed —on 'people,' or on the prepositions?"
>
> When I replied, "My recollection is, that Mr. Lincoln, when he delivered that speech, emphasized the prepositions," you should have seen how surprised Dr. Hancock seemed!
>
> "Do you mean to say that you yourself heard him deliver that speech?" "Yes, and I was not more than thirty feet from him, and could hear every word of it." "Well," he said, "do you realize what a rare piece of good fortune that was?" "I considered it a great privilege at the time," I said, "or I should not have undergone the jamming

of the crowd to do it, but you make me feel that it was a greater privilege than I then realized." "To hear such a speech from such a man," he said, "I should consider it one of the greatest opportunities of my life."

This is all so neat and precise, we don't see how anyone can argue the matter further. It's all the more remarkable in that the facts seem to be in opposition to current practice and what one might deduce from the elocution manuals. Noah Webster (*An American Selection of Lessons in Reading and Speaking*, etc., 8th Hartford ed., 1793, p. 4) says: "particles, such as, of, to, as, and, etc. require no force of utterance, unless they happen to be emphatical, which is rarely the case."

EXPANDED JOURNAL. *The Central States Speech Journal*, now in the tenth year, has been expanded from 64 pages an issue to 80, and from twice a year to three times. Among other innovations is a series called "Reflections from the Retired." Wayland Maxfield Parrish reflects in the autumn number and John T. Marshman in the winter issue. An index of all numbers, 1949-1958, is printed in the autumn number. For book reviews has been substituted an article on groups of books. Subscription rate is $3.00. Keith Brooks of Ohio State is editor, and H. L. Ewbank of Purdue, business manager.

NEW JOURNALS. *Language and Speech*, a new journal published by Robert Draper Ltd., Kerbihan House, 85 Udney Park Road, Teddington, Middlesex, England, is being issued four times a year. In an editorial note to the first number, January-March, 1958, D. B. Fry says the journal was founded not only because of "the practical needs of communication engineering, but also from a realization which has spread ever more rapidly that speech is an aspect of human behaviour of the utmost importance for the study of mankind." The editor, who is in the Department of Phonetics, University College, Gower Street, London, W.C. 1, elaborates on the function of the journal:

> The purpose of this journal is to furnish a medium for publication in which the fundamental problems of language and speech form the centre of interest. One of its most important functions will be to offer space, not only for reports of experimental work, but for the extended treatment of conclusions which may be drawn from such work and for the development of theories which represent a synthesis of knowledge derived from experiment. It will attempt to deal with all aspects of the subject and it is therefore not possible to give an exhaustive list of the subjects that will be covered; among them will be language structure, psychology of language and speech, transmission and reception of speech, mechanical translation, mechanical speech recognition and synthesis, language statistics, abnormalities of language and speech.
>
> It is hoped that contributions will be made by a wide variety of research workers—linguists, philosophers, logicians, psychologists, physiologists, physicists, engineers, statisticians—and that the diverse material published may be unified in some degree by its relation to the central theme and purpose of the journal: an understanding of the fundamental problems of language and speech.

Subscription rate is $11.50 a year, single copies $4.00.

Logos, volume I, number 1, was issued in October. It is published by The National Hospital for Speech Disorders, 61 Irving Place, New York 3, and replaces *Talk*, which was published continuously for thirty-eight years. Godfrey E. Arnold is editor, with an international board of eighteen. Subscription rate is $5.00 for three years, $1.75 for one year, single copies $1.00. In a letter announcing the journal the editor declared the policy:

> The new periodical will be devoted exclusively to the publication of scientific papers in the entire field of human communication. Experimental, theoretical, and clinical papers on language, speech, voice, hearing, acoustics, psychology, psychiatry, neurology, and semantics, with special reference to physiology, pathology, and therapy, will be contributed by specialists in these fields.

INDEX. The *Dramatic Index*, 1909-1949, is being reprinted in cumulated form, in two volumes. Most of the individual issues are now out-of-print. References listed are to articles on dramatics, stage productions, actors, actresses, and playwrights, both on stage and in motion picture. An annual list of books and plays will be given. Price of the two volumes will be

$325.00. A brochure can be had from the publishers, G. K. Hall & Co., 97 Oliver Street, Boston 10.

CODE. The American Forensic Association has approved and issued a "Code for Contests in Oratory." It was drafted by the AFA Committee on Professional Relations, after conference with officials of the American Legion, Optimist International, Intercollegiate Peace Speech Association, International Toastmistress Clubs, and the National Forensic League.

"The student should be allowed reasonable latitude in subject development," reads one of the rules, "so he can advance his own convictions." Another suggestion is that "a reasonable honorarium, plus expenses, should be provided for the services of the judge." Single copies are free; copies in quantity cost five cents each. Address: Robert O. Weiss, Secretary-Treasurer, American Forensic Association, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES. The Oral Interpretation Interest Group has prepared bibliographies of articles in non-speech journals for spring, summer, fall 1957, and winter 1958. Copies may be had free from Chloe Armstrong, Baylor University.

NEW DIRECTORY. The 1959 SAA *Directory* was published March 16. The price this year is $2.50 postpaid. Editor Owen Peterson estimates 2,000 copies will be sold. The directory abounds in usable information. Evidently members do not realize this, else the circulation would be at least doubled. The editor informs us that Michigan State University again has the greatest number of members and that eight of the ten institutions with highest membership are members of the Big Ten. There may be, the editor adds, a slight error in the figures since some members use home addresses and don't bother to fill in the complete form of information. The "top ten" for 1959 are: Michigan State University 61, Louisiana State University 44, University of Michigan 44, University of Illinois 43, Northwestern University 42, Ohio State University 41, University of Wisconsin 35, State University of Iowa 33, Purdue University 33, Queens College 33.

Twelve other schools have twenty or more members.

STUDENT GROUP MEMBERSHIPS. SAA has a special rate of $3.50 for undergraduate students. For this fee the member receives all rights and privileges, and subscription to either *QJS* or *The Speech Teacher*. Beginning last September, a new group membership plan was started. If ten undergraduate memberships are sent in at one time, the rate is only $2.50. Copies of the preferred journal are mailed individually—no bulk bother. Executive Secretary Peterson reports 433 students are now enrolled in the group plan. Schools having ten or more students in the plan are: University of Akron, Bradley University, University of Cincinnati, Edinboro (Pa.) State Teachers College, Emerson College, Florida State University, Fordham University, Geneseo State Teachers College, Glenville State College, Harding College, Hofstra College, Illinois State Normal University, Kent State University, Lamar State College, Long Beach State College, Louisiana State University, Marietta College, Mary Hardin-Baylor College, Mississippi State College for Women, University of Missouri, Montclair State College, Mundelein College, Murray State College, New York University, North Texas State College, Ohio Wesleyan University, Queens College, Saint Olaf College, San Fernando State College, Southern University, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Wabash College, Wisconsin State College (Eau Claire), University of Wisconsin.

AETA-ANTA STUDENT MEMBERSHIPS. AETA has 904 student memberships so far for 1959. By arrangement with ANTA, joint student membership is offered for $5.00. Members receive ETJ, and since ANTA does not issue a journal, also a subscription to *Theatre Arts*. (Total membership in AETA last year was 3,732, an increase of 23% over 1957. A goal of 5,000 members by silver anniversary time, 1961, has been set.)

THEATRE SCHEDULES

Adelphi College: *Aphrodite*, a new play by Louise Platt adapted from the novel by Pierre Louys.

Carthage College: *Pygmalion, Christ in the Concrete City, Show Boat, A Sleep of Prisoners*, Anouilh's *Antigone*.

Fresno State College: *The Circle, Oedipus, King of Thebes, The Diary of Anne Frank, Tartuffe*.

King's College, Wilkes-Barre: *The Crucible, Arsenic and Old Lace, The Cocktail Party*.

Northern Illinois University: *Ah Wilderness!, Hedda Gabler, The Crucible.*

San Jose State College: *The Confidential Clerk, Lute Song; King Midas and the Golden Touch,* children's theatre production.

Southwest Missouri State College: *The Trojan Women, That Rascal Scapin, The Jar, The Slave With Two Faces, Hope Is a Thing With Feathers, Summer Fury, Down in the Valley,* workshop theatre productions; *The Time of Your Life, She Stoops to Conquer.*

Southwest Texas State Teachers College: *Playboy of the Western World, A Sunny Morning, A Phoenix Too Frequent, Many Moons; Cockleburr,* original play for fine arts festival, by Ramsey Yelvington.

Stetson University: *Christmas in the Marketplace, The Menaechmi, A Midsummer Night's Dream.*

University of Hartford: *Beyond the Horizon.*

University of Kansas City: Giannini's *The Taming of the Shrew, The Would-be Gentleman; The Magic Horn of Charlemagne,* community children's theatre production.

Wellesley College: *Yerma, The Chairs, As We Were, The Cocktail Party, All's Well That Ends Well; A Pound on Demand, Time to Go,* experimental theatre productions.

Whittier College: *Harvey,* featuring members of speech faculty and students.

Yale University: *Agamemnon* and *Mourning Becomes Electra,* a play marathon using much of the same cast for both and similar staging and scenic design.

Theatre Notes

James H. Clancy, State University of Iowa, and editor of *Educational Theatre Journal,* has received a Ford Foundation fellowship of $10,000. The grant is one of ten given to theatre directors for purposes of "stimulating their creative development." The other nine fellowships went to directors of non-university theatres, such as John Reich of Goodman Memorial in Chicago and Mrs. Nina Vance of Houston's Alley Theatre.

Director Clancy will take 1959-1960 off, and stimulate his creativity in London, Paris, Vienna, Milan, Athens, Rome, Avignon, and Belgrade, for a start. He can draw on the amount as he wishes; it's a sort of super-sabbatical. From 1936 to 1958, Ford Fellow Clancy was at San Jose State College.

Patricia McIlrath, University of Kansas City, in February directed an off-Broadway production of *Electra,* at the Rita Allen Theatre, 120 Madison Avenue. Starred in the cast were Judith Evelyn, Frances Adler, Murray Matheson, Joan Wetmore. In December Miss Evelyn was guest star in the play at the University of Kansas City, and later made arrangements for the New York production.

Show Business (Feb. 23, 1959, p. 1) estimates 323,294 tickets to New York live radio and TV shows are available each month. CBS has 227,942; NBC has 56,000, and ABC, 39,352.

Kalamazoo College has a "Coffee Critique" following opening night of the theatre season. Actors, crew, staff, and audience gather to discuss the play and the production.

Charles Shattuck has acquired for the University of Illinois library a set of original water color costume designs for William Charles Macready's Shakespearean productions in 1842-43. Working from the original prompt books, especially those for *As You Like It* and *King John,* Professor Shattuck is attempting a descriptive reconstruction of the productions.

The annual department of speech lecture at Wellesley this year is in honor of the new Jewett Arts Center. The subject is "Four Talks," by Stark Young, on plays, acting, directing, and design. It will be given on April 14 and 15.

The Ohio State University department of speech has established a theatre research center in the main library on the Columbus campus. Researchers in theatre are invited to come to the campus to consult the archives of the OSU Theatre. *The OSU Theatre Collection Bulletin* can be procured by writing to John H. McDowell, Director. The *Bulletin* reports research activities in seminars conducted with materials in the collection. The research center invites college, university, and high-school production groups to make up package units of selected shows and send them for inclusion. The package might consist of pictures of the set, action shots, programs, criticism, and such.

Educational Theatre Journal for March lists the summer programs of ninety university and company theatres. The index was compiled by Ross D. Smith, chairman of AETA Summer Theatre Project.

At the University of Illinois, the fifth original prize play was staged in March. The winning play, *Condition Three,* selected from seventy manuscripts, was written by Peter Bowman, New York magazine publisher. In this series, produced by the theatre in conjunction

with a university festival of arts program, the author is in residence during rehearsals, and works with the cast and director. Barnard Hewitt was director.

Chicagoland Bulletin, a monthly listing of all theatre productions in the Chicago area, has come to an end. The reason is that W. Jack Higgins, the editor, has now retired from the Chicago Park District.

At the December convention, an award of $500.00 was made to National Thespian Society as "the outstanding person, group, or school in the high-school bracket of regional theatre production." Leon C. Miller, Executive Secretary of the society, accepted the honor from Andrew Geoly, Vice President of Eaves Costume Company, donor. It will be an annual award.

On March 20 and 21 students in the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art of the State University of Iowa held a second conference entitled Imagination '59, for drama students in Midwestern colleges and universities. Some 250 students from 22 schools participated. The program, which consisted of a series of exercises in acting and directing in addition to the presentation of one-act plays, was planned by a committee of Iowa students. The Universities of Minnesota, Missouri, and Iowa, St. Cloud State Teachers College, and Cornell and Parsons Colleges presented one-act plays. Lee Strasberg was the featured speaker.

Forensic Notes

HIGH SCHOOL QUESTIONS. The general problem selected for 1959-1960 high school discussion and debate is: What policy in labor-management relations will best serve the people of the United States? The discussion questions are: (1) How can the public interest best be protected in labor-management disputes? (2) What should be the responsibilities of labor and management in solving the current labor-management problems? (3) What should be the responsibilities of government in solving the current labor-management problems?

The debate propositions are: (1) Resolved: that Section 14b of the National Labor Relations Act should be repealed. (2) Resolved: that the federal government should substantially increase its regulation of labor unions. (3) Resolved: that the federal government should require arbitration of labor disputes in all basic industries.

At the December meeting of the NUEA committee, one discussion query and one debate resolution will be selected. Bower Aly, University of Oregon, Eugene, is executive secretary of the NUEA Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation.

HONOR. At the annual Pi Kappa Delta convention in Bowling Green, Ohio, in March, the distinguished alumnus award was given to Dwayne Orton, former debate coach at College of the Pacific and president of Stockton College. Pi Kappa Deltan Orton is now educational consultant to International Business Machines, and is editor of *Think*. Waldo W. Braden of Louisiana State was selected to give the address by a distinguished member of the speech profession.

ATHENAEAN AGAIN. In the last issue we reported on the Athenaean Literary Society at the University of Missouri, how it still flourishes 116 years after its founding. Herein is narrated a bit of recent pageantry. But let us start at the beginning.

On the evening of January 9, 1892, the society was scheduled to hold its annual open session in the main auditorium of Academic Hall. At seven o'clock that evening some of the program arrangers and other early comers had arrived, and the band was tuning up. Suddenly the candelabra in the ceiling fell to the floor—the lights going out, of course—and flames burst forth from the floor above. Everybody got out safely, and thoughtfully took with them the minutes and the piano. The building was a ruin. Six columns that now are a sort of landmark on the campus were all that remained. Christian College in Columbia invited the Athenaean to use its rooms, and Stephens College took in the other literary society, the Union. Two weeks later Athenaean had sufficiently recovered to stage the original program in Haden Opera House.

In January of this year, the 1892 program was reenacted in Jesse Hall, built to replace old Academic. The affair was sponsored jointly by the society and Missouri chapter of Delta Sigma Rho, celebrating its fiftieth anniversary. A special chapter banquet was held, at which Herold T. Ross of DePauw, national president, spoke. Here is the original 1892 program, given for those who would like to know what a late-nineteenth-century open session college literary society program really looked like.

THE FORTY-NINTH
ANNUAL OPEN SESSION
ATHENAEAN
LITERARY SOCIETY.
"Regina Scientia Mundi"

Haden Opera House — January 23rd, 1892

MUSIC

The National Anthem.

PRAYER.

MUSIC.

March From Aida—Verdi.

Inaugural Address.

Declamation—Curfew Bells.

MUSIC.

Bronze Horse Overture—Auber.

Debate.—Resolved: That Immigration Should Be Prohibited.

MUSIC.

Selections From Fra Diavolo—Auber.

Declamation—Signing of the Magna Charta.

Oration—Ireland and the Irish.

Paper—Athenaean Joker.

MUSIC.

Washington Post March—Sousa.

Buildings and Curriculum

During the fall semester, the Division of Speech Arts, Fresno State College, established two therapy groups for stutterers. One, for adolescents, is under the direction of Donald Wilson; the other, for young adults, is under the direction of Bernard Stoll.

The Mustard and Cheese Dramatics Club of Lehigh University has moved into its new quarters, a large area in the basement of one of the buildings on campus. The club now has a larger workshop area for the construction and painting of scenery, equipped with new power and hand tools. The club will also have a green room, and rooms for storing properties.

The speech and hearing clinic at Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, directed by Earl W. Blank, has moved into new quarters, a brick one-story building centrally located on the campus and reserved for the clinic's use. The equipment, a gift from the Vocational Rehabilitation Federal Grant, includes an Allison 21B audiometer, a psychogalvanometer, sound-treated testing room for hearing aid evaluations, Beltone portable audiometers, sound scribers, tape recorders, record players, audiovisual equipment, and creative play equipment. Northeastern now grants a Standard Special Education Certificate in speech and hearing therapy.

Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, reports the completion of a new building which will house speech therapy, audiology, and student health services. Facilities for hearing aid evaluation are included.

Appointments

Alabama Polytechnic Institute: Don Canty, instructor; Mrs. Cruz Hardigree, speech and hearing clinic.

Atlantic Union College: Wayne Andrews, assistant professor, replacing Margaret E. Palmer who, with her husband, is now teaching in the Pacific Agricultural and Industrial School, Navajoa, Mexico.

Carthage College: Shandy Holland, chairman of the department of speech and theatre art.

College of William and Mary: B. Frank Lee, assistant professor; Mrs. Marilyn Maneri, speech and hearing clinic.

Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, Oklahoma: Don Rampp, audiologist and supervisor of clinical practice.

University of Washington: David B. Strother, assistant professor and director of forensics; Thomas Scheidel, instructor; James Aten, Delmond Bennett, Marianne Davis, Norman Fleishman, Richard King, Manuel Leonardo, Eugene Oulette, Loren Webb, pre-doctoral associates; Charles Blondino, Lewis Bright, Floyd Jackson, Nancy McCartney, Janice Meister, Glenn Peck, Carol Troffer, and Ronald Young, teaching assistants.

Promotions

Boston University: Norman E. Vuilleumier, associate professor.

Northwestern University: Charles F. Hunter, chairman, department of radio, television, and film.

San Fernando Valley State College: Malcolm O. Sillars, William E. Schlosser, associate professors.

South Dakota State College: A. R. Christenson, administrative assistant to the president; Donald E. Sikkink, director of forensics and head of the department.

University of Pittsburgh: Joe M. Ball, administrative officer of the speech department.

University of Richmond: Bert E. Bradley, Jr., associate professor.

RETIREMENTS

Mrs. Dorothy R. Dalton, who, since 1918, has scheduled Anglo-American touring debaters and lecturers, has retired. From 1946 to 1958 she was with the English Speaking Union in London. Her last position was head of the Universities' Department. Much of her work in recent years has dealt with awards of fellowships for British students who wish to study in the United States.

From 1918 to 1946 she was with the American University Union, and became assistant director. Although under a different name, the Union was really the London office of the Institute of International Education. When the office was closed she joined the English Speaking Union.

Asked about what her plans are, Mrs. Dalton replied:

> After nearly 40 years' service to the cause of Anglo-American relations, I feel I do not need, nor do I intend, to seek further employment. I have reached the age when it is not only pleasant, but allowable, to be one's own mistress and to follow where fancy leads.

From all of us, and especially those who have benefited from the debater exchange program, should go best wishes for a really fanciful retirement.

Eugene Hess, who has been at Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, since 1931, retired in December.

Carroll P. Lahman has retired from Pasadena College, where he has served since 1948. He taught at Drake University in 1921-1922, at Western Michigan University, 1922-1940, at Albion, 1940-1947, and on leave from Pasadena in 1950-1951, at the University of Colorado. He served as vice president of SAA in 1929 and in 1930.

Professor Lahman decided years ago that he would retire at age sixty if he could, and he made it. He has gone back to his farm in Franklin Grove, Illinois. When he gets the farm organized, the house and barn remodeled, he thinks he may do some part time teaching.

MEMBERSHIPS EMERITI. The Administrative Council has granted emeritus membership to Margaret Montague, Fort Smith Junior College, Arkansas, and to Claude M. Wise, Louisiana State University.

PERSONALS

Johnnye Akin, University of Denver, has accepted the post of Regional Auditioner for the American Academy of Dramatic Arts. It is now possible for potential students in the Colorado region to audition locally instead of having to travel to New York to comply with tests for entrance.

W. Norwood Brigance of Wabash will address the 57th annual convention of the Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers, at the Chicago Hilton, April 18. The occasion is the banquet meeting, and Mr. Brigance will talk on "A Teacher's Heritage."

Lionel Crocker was the guest judge for the annual Kentucky Oratorical Association on March 24, 1959. The contests were held at Asbury College.

Helen M. Donovan was licensed after competitive examination, and on December 23, 1958, appointed Assistant Director of Speech Improvement, New York City Public Schools. For the past three years, she has served as Co-ordinator, Speech Program for Children with Retarded Mental Development, New York City Board of Education.

Esther M. Doyle, associate professor of English at Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pennsylvania, has just completed her tenth year as visiting professor for the Arts Program of the Association of American Colleges. During the last decade she has read poetry and drama to fifty colleges in fifteen states.

Donley Feddersen, Northwestern University, devotes part of his time to a new appointment as program director for Chicago's educational television station WTTW.

Virginia R. Miller of Wellesley was editor of the Spring 1958 *Bulletin* of the New England Speech Association. She conducted a survey for the Committee on the Recruitment and Supply of Teachers of Speech, SAA, in the New England states.

Paul Bruce Pettit, New York State College for Teachers at Albany, has been awarded a State University of New York Summer Re-

search Fellowship and will devote the summer to a specialized study of Gordon Craig.

Ralph Richardson, UCLA, is now Planning and Research Secretary to Edmund G. Brown, governor of California. He also serves on the Los Angeles City Board of Education.

Douglas A. Russell, University of Kansas City, costume designer for the Playhouse productions for the last four years, will be on leave of absence next year to study at Yale under a Danforth grant.

Cj Stevens, director of radio-TV, University of Kansas City, has a leave of absence to study cybernetics; he will be in Santa Monica, California.

Subert Turbyfill, director of speech for Canal Zone Junior College, was the recipient of the Eloy Alfaro Citation for Humanities in December 1958. The award is given by the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation to perpetuate the memory of the martyred president of Ecuador, the first great leader for general public education in South America. Mr. Turbyfill reports that in the cultural pattern of South American countries, the award of the citation for humanities corresponds to the awarding of the honorary doctorate in the United States except that the citation is not so common.

Robert West, Brooklyn College, was a member of the planning committee meeting in February for the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth.

Earl W. Wiley, Ohio State University Emeritus, '57, chairman of the Ohio Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, addressed a Lincoln memorial meeting sponsored by the National Park Service in Washington, D. C., in February. The talk was taped for broadcast over "Voice of America."

JOHN STINE, 1903-1959

John Stine, founder and chairman of the Department of Speech, De Paul University, Chicago, died January 2. Professor Stine was born at Stronghurst, Illinois, August 5, 1903. A John Stine Memorial Collection has been established in the library, and a memorial scholarship is being arranged.

Professor Stine received a diploma from the Columbia College of Expression in 1923, a B.S. degree from Northwestern University in 1930, and an M.S. degree from De Paul in 1937. He was currently working on a Ph.D. degree in psychology from the University of Ottawa, and had submitted his dissertation. The degree was awarded posthumously on February 2.

He was with the Sprague Players, Redpath Chautauqua, from 1923-1926, director of speech in the Tulsa public schools from 1930-1937, and chairman of the department of radio at Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Missouri, from 1937-1942. He had been a member and chairman of the department at De Paul since 1944.

Professor Stine was an astute critic of interpretation and theatre, and had a rapport with people not limited to the classroom and academic associations. At a memorial interpretation recital in De Paul Center Theatre, April 5, readings were given by Charlotte Lee and Alvina Krause of Northwestern University, and by Russell W. Lembke, Marjorie Morgan, and A. T. Martin of De Paul.

A. T. MARTIN
De Paul University

HOWARD WILLIAM TOWNSEND, 1909-1958

Howard William Townsend, forty-eight, associate professor of speech and a member of the University of Texas speech department staff since 1937, died on October 10, 1958, after an illness of several months. He was born March 13, 1909.

His untimely demise was a shock to the speech staff and his students. As a colleague, he was always cooperative, able, and untiring in his efforts to aid in the development of the field of speech, always unselfish in any task for the good of the group. His students found him a man of friendly demeanor, high principles, always willing to help each member of his courses to attain the highest degree of proficiency in speech work. Professor Townsend was a *teacher* in the finest sense of the word.

He had a broad educational training. He was graduated from Weimar High School in 1927, and received his B.S. degree in Educational Administration and English at the University of Texas in 1932. He was awarded the M.A. degree in English and Speech in 1939, and received his Ph.D. degree in Speech from the University of Wisconsin in 1947. Post Ph.D. work at Columbia University in 1949 completed his formal education.

Professor Townsend's teaching experience began in 1929 in the secondary schools of Texas. In 1937 he joined the speech staff of the University of Texas, where he taught, with the

exception of three years at the University of Wisconsin and one year at Brooklyn College, until his death in 1958. Summer teaching included the University of Florida (1948), Stephen F. Austin State College (1951 and 1957), and a post summer session at the University of Southern California (1957).

His professional activities were many and diverse. He served as consultant and lecturer with the Texas Education Agency, the University of Texas Division of Extension, and numerous business and professional groups. He was editor of *The Southern Speech Journal* (1951-54); consulting editor of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* (1951-54), and member of various committees in the Speech Association of America, Southern Speech Association, and the Texas Speech Association. His publications, particularly in articles pertaining to speech problems, were numerous and appeared in *QJS, Southern Speech Journal,* and journals in other fields.

His friends, his colleagues, and his students will remember and treasure his cordiality, enthusiasm, and energy, always extended without stint to those who sought his aid and counsel.

T. A. Rousse, Chairman
Department of Speech
The University of Texas

Summer Plans

The University of Colorado plans two programs of interest to those wanting an attractive summer setting in which to study. The 26th Writers Conference will be held July 20-August 7. Since it is the Colorado Centennial Year, it will feature Western writers, A. B. Guthrie, Jr., and Stewart Holbrook. William Peden, Virginia Sorensen, Walker Gibson, and Bud Kay, son of one of the founders of the Eastern Speech Association, will be among the leaders. Margaret Robb, Department of Speech, directs the Conference.

The Shakespeare Festival at the University of Colorado will be held August 1-15. J. H. Crouch of Colorado, Ralph Symonds of Phillips Academy, and Howard M. Banks, University of Southern California, will be the directors of *Macbeth, Richard II,* and *Midsummer Night's Dream.*

Frieda Reed and Maizie Weil, sponsors of Troupe 1000 of the National Thespian Society, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania, will be in charge of the High School Theatre Workshop at the University of Denver.

Fresno State College is planning a ten-day workshop for speech therapists in August, to be devoted to a study of social, medical, and psychological involvements in selected speech problems. The case approach will be followed, with particular attention to staffing problems.

New York State College for Teachers, at Albany, will offer courses in the theory and technique of arena theatre. The State College Arena Summer Theatre will produce plays under the direction of Jarka M. Burian, who has replaced Paul Bruce Pettit. Assisting Mr. Burian will be Harvey Whetstone, associate professor at Plattsburgh State Teachers College.

The Northern Illinois University Speech and Hearing Clinic announces that assistantships will be available for graduate students interested in participating in its six-week summer speech and hearing residential program. Dates for the program are June 27 to August 9. These graduate assistantships are for the positions of speech therapists, hearing therapists, and counselors.

Restless from inactivity in summer, the University of Pittsburgh debaters are planning a summer invitational tournament, July 24-25. The proposition will be: The United States should withdraw its military forces from western Europe in return for Russian withdrawal from the satellite countries. Undergraduate and graduate students will debate together. For details write to Robert P. Newman, director.

Two workshops in school speech activities will be held at Texas Technological College at Lubbock. One in dramatics and forensics for high school students will be held July 20-August 1. The other for teachers will explore problems and opportunities in directing speech activities. It will be held July 15-August 1.

Students may supplement the latter course with the American Theater Tour, August 1-20. This credit course includes attendance at professional resident companies off Broadway, such as the Margo Jones Theater in Dallas, arena theaters, a Shakespearean company, several Broadway plays, productions at Radio City, other universities, etc. The course is open to undergraduate students only. Travel costs, excluding meals but including hotel, transportation, and theater tickets will be $200-$250.

Western Reserve University will be host to a seminar-workshop of the Institute of General Semantics, August 15-31. The basic course for teachers, trainers, researchers, and executives will cover theory, principles, practice of gen-

eral semantics, non-aristotelian orientations, extensional methods based on Alfred Korzybski's books and current developments by leaders in the field. Members of the faculty will be: Marjorie M. Kendig, director of the Institute of General Semantics in Lakeville, Connecticut; O. R. Bontrager of Pennsylvania State University; Dr. Russell Meyers of the State University of Iowa College of Medicine; Dr. Marjorie Swanson of Bowman Gray School of Medicine; Walter Weese of the U. S. Air Force Academy; and Walter Probert of Western Reserve University School of Law.

Edna Hill Young will offer a course in motokinesthetic speech therapy, July 6-24, in her private workshop in Los Angeles, with Sara Stinchfield Hawk as guest lecturer. Some scholarships are available.

Purdue University is holding a number of workshops this summer. A pre-college institute in speech and hearing therapy will be conducted July 6-10. Twenty-four junior high school girls will be given scholarships to cover tuition and board and room. Psi Iota Xi sponsors the institute. A three week workshop in speech and hearing therapy for classroom teachers and school nurses will be held June 8-26. A theatre workshop for high school teachers and students comes June 22-July 10, and a session for teachers on teaching public address, debate, and discussion from July 13 to August 2.

HELP. D. R. Henry, Oregon State College, Corvallis, finds he has a number of extra copies of *Theatre Arts*, but alas, lacks some issues. He offers an exchange. Better write before sending on what you have.

Extra copies—will exchange (vol., year, mo.): 11, 1927—7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12; 12, 1928—3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12; 13, 1929—complete; 14, 1930—complete; 15, 1931—1, 2; 16, 1932—6; 18, 1934—1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12; 26, 1942—4, 5, 9, 11, 12; 27, 1943—all except #6; 28, 1944—all except #4 and #10; 30, 1946—1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11; 31, 1947—1, 2, 3, 4; 33, 1949—1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11; 34, 1950—1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9; 38, 1954—1, 10; 39, 1955—1.

Issues missing—needs: 1, 2, 3: all numbers; 4, 1920—1, 2, 3; 5, 1921—3; 6, 1922—3; 9, 1925—5; 10, 1926—3, 8; 11, 1927—2; 15, 1931—5; 29, 1945—6, 7; 30, 1946—9, 12; 31, 1947—7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12; 32, 1948—1, 2, 3; 34, 1950—12; 35, 1951—3; 36, 1952—3; 37, 1953—2.

MORE HELP. Karl R. Wallace, editor of the SAA publication, *History of Speech Education in America*, got a distress call in March from the Reverend Lloyd B. Hull, First Baptist Church, Shelby, Ohio. Seems he is a graduate student at Wayne, borrowed a copy of the book, misplaced it, and now can't locate a copy anywhere to replace it. If anybody knows of a copy available, Mr. Hull would greatly appreciate hearing about it. The book was published in September, 1954, 1500 copies, and type distributed. By December, 1958, the work was out of print.

Festivals in Interpretation

The annual Apple Blossom Festival conducted by Moiree S. Compere and sponsored by the department of speech, Michigan State University, will be held May 6-9 at the Kellogg Center for Continuing Education. Events are run on a festival, not a contest, basis. Entrants receive individual criticisms, but are not ranked. Outstanding readers will appear on TV. On Saturday, May 9, a workshop on oral interpretation will be held. Martin Cobin, University of Illinois, will be the main resource person. He will also read at the festival dinner. A reading play, *Early Dawn*, written by Russell Porter of the University of Denver, will be presented May 8.

Another interpretation festival, the Peach Blossom Festival, was held for the first time on March 13-14 at Fresno State College. Alice Merrill of Roosevelt High School, Fresno, was in charge of arrangements.

SPEECH MEMORIALS. Among the memorials at Gettysburg is one to the speech. A guide will tell you that the Congressional act creating Gettysburg National Park authorized a granite and bronze monument for the speech itself, as distinct from the occasion or the maker of the speech. If you seem a little doubtful about this, the guide may expand and declare this to be the only monument to a speech in the whole world. Anyway, it is there, a half semicircle of granite, head-high, with a bust of Lincoln in the middle, and bronze pages containing the speech and historical details on either side.

Hearing about another monument to a speech, in Warrensburg, Missouri, we wrote to William R. Dodge, chairman of the speech department at Central Missouri State College. He not only supplied us with the details, but with a hand-

some 8 x 10 photograph of the monument. It all goes back to September 23, four score and eight years ago, 1870, when Senator George Graham Vest delivered his tribute to the dog. As everyone probably knows, the Senator took the case out of sentiment. A hound named "Old Drum" had been killed wantonly, and the owner sued for damages. The Senator's summation to the jury brought damages and immortality for Senator and dog.

The memorial is a granite block with the speech on an affixed bronze tablet. Incidentally, the speech is about the same length as the Gettysburg Address. On top of the block is a lifesize cast of "Old Drum" sniffing the air. The local chamber of commerce sponsored the project, and money came from public subscription. On September 27, 1958, the memorial was dedicated in a round of affairs. There was a parade, an obedience dog show, a speech by Senator Stuart Symington, a rendition of the speech by John Swearingen of Knob Noster, a drama student at Central, a tribute to dogs by Captain Will Judy, editor of *Dog World*, and an unveiling speech, by the state attorney general, on the Senator's importance beyond the canine world.

Missouri Historical Review (January, 1959, pp. 169-170) sedately records the whole affair. Reporter Dodge says there is no doubt about it, the monument is to the speech, and not just to a dog or Senator Vest. "The one absolutely unselfish friend that a man can have in this selfish world, the one that never deserts him and the one that never proves ungrateful or treacherous, is his dog." It's now writ in bronze.

SURVIVAL OF FITTEST. Some note should be taken of Darwin's *The Origin of Species* centennial. Wally Frank, the mail order tobacco pipe man in New York, has an old standard, "McGuffeys Reader" pipe. It is a long-stemmed design, the sort of pipe Carlyle is pictured smoking, the whole point being to keep smoke out of your eyes as you read. The latest description is, "Wonderful for TV Watching."

HONEST BOOKMAN. In a world of advertising superlatives, the lengths bookmen go to describe imperfections in their wares is refreshing testimony to the eternal verities. Here is description of item 324, Percy Dobell and Son's List 157.

> RHETORIC. (Essays on), abridged chiefly from Dr. Blair's Lectures, 12 mo, calf, *binding worn, poor copy, a leaf defective*, 10 s. Boston (U.S.A.), 1789.

NET. The Educational Television and Radio Center has moved its production headquarters from Ann Arbor, Michigan, to the Coliseum Building, 10 Columbus Circle, New York City. The departments of distribution and research will remain in Ann Arbor. Kenneth L. Yourd, vice president, explained the move in a press release by saying, "The decision to move our major headquarters to New York City is in recognition of the fact that the young educational TV movement must be based in the heart of national, cultural and mass communications activity."

INVITATION

Your news and notes are welcomed. Deadline for the next issue, October, is August 15. What happened during the summer? Please let us know. Address: Shop Talk, 204A Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Illinois.

university of denver
SCHOOL OF SPEECH

examples of advanced programs of study

MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE

52½ graduate quarter hours without thesis
45 graduate quarter hours with thesis

major concentrations	cognate areas
Discussion and Public Address	Communication Methodology
Speech and Hearing Disorders	Psychology
Communication Methodology	Theatre Arts
Oral Interpretation	Radio and TV

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DEGREE

majors	minors	cognate areas
Public Address and Discussion	Speech Pathology	Communication Methodology
Speech Pathology and Hearing	Communication Methodology	Psychology and Special Education
Theatre Arts	Oral Interpretation	English Literature
Communication Methodology	Mass Media	Business Administration or Social Science
Mass Media	Communication Methodology	English Literature

1959 SUMMER SESSION

VISITING LECTURERS

Bernice Prince Biggs, Ph.D., Coordinator of Remedial Laboratory Program, and Supervisor of Reading Laboratory, Language Arts Division, San Francisco State College, San Francisco, California.
J. Samuel Bois, Ph.D., Counselors to Management, Inc., Los Angeles, California.
Carl A. Dallinger, Ph.D., Coordinator of Communication Skills, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Robert E. Pittenger, M.D., Director, Syracuse Mental Health Clinic, Syracuse, New York (Non-verbal communication).
C. M. Wise, Ph.D., Emeritus Professor and Head of the Department of Speech, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana (phonetics and linguistics).

SPECIAL FEATURES

7th Workshop for Directors of Forensics	June 15-July 24
24th Summer High School Institute	June 15-July 17
13th Summer Laboratory in Interpersonal Communication	June 15-Aug. 14
12th Summer Workshop in Basic Communication	June 15-July 17

spring quarter
March 30-June 10, 1959

summer session
June 15-August 14, 1959

autumn quarter
September 17-December 4, 1959

winter quarter
January 4-March 18, 1960

for further information write:

ELWOOD MURRAY, Ph.D., Director
School of Speech, Box A
University of Denver
Denver 10, Colorado